

BIBLIOTECA DE AUTORES CRISTIANOS

SACRAE THEOLOGIAE
SUMMA
IB

ON THE CHURCH OF CHRIST



ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

By
Joachim Salaverri, S.J.
and
Michaele Nicolau, S.J.

Translated from Latin by
Kenneth Baker, S.J.

KEEP THE FAITH

© 2015 Keep the Faith, Inc
All rights reserved
ISBN 978-0-9912268-7-0
Library of Congress Control Number
Printed in the United States of America

NIHIL OBSTAT:
Dr. Vincentius Serrano
Censor

IMPRIMI POTEST:
Emmanuel Ollerros, S.J.
Prae. Prov. Tolet.

IMPRIMATUR:
+Joseph Maria
Ep. Aux. et Vic. Gral.
Madrid, 27 August 1955

The original title of this book is: *SACRAE THEOLOGIAE SUMMA, I. Theologia Fundamentalis.*

The book was published in Madrid, Spain, in Latin, by:
Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos. (B.A.C.)

This English translation was made with permission of Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, P. Carlos Grandados Garcia, Director General.

This book is a translation of the third and fourth treatises in *SACRAE THEOLOGIAE SUMMA, I* of B.A.C. under the title of *De Ecclesia* and *De sacra Scriptura*, pp. 497-1135.

C o n t e n t s

V O L U M E I B

T R E A T I S E I I I

On the Church

THEOLOGICAL NOTES	1
ABBREVIATIONS	2
INTRODUCTION.....	6
BOOK I – On the social constitution of the Church.....	19
CHAPTER I – On the institution of the hierarchical Church	19
ARTICLE I – Christ the King preached the Kingdom of God.....	19
Thesis 1. Jesus Christ preached a universal Kingdom, not only eschatological, spiritual and internal, but also existing on earth, visible and external	19
Scholium. <i>In place of the economy of the Old Testament, Christ substituted the Kingdom preached by himself</i>	35
ARTICLE II – Institution of the College of the Apostles	37
Thesis 2. Christ instituted the College of Twelve Apostles, to whom he committed his mission; and he conferred the same Apostolate on St. Paul that he did on the College	37
Scholium. <i>The Mission that Christ gave to the Apostles is that which he had as man.</i>	45
ARTICLE III – Christ handed over to the Apostles social power	48
Thesis 3. Christ handed over to the Apostles the power of ruling, teaching and sanctifying, and he obligated men to submit themselves to this power. Hence he is the author of a hierarchical society, which he called Church ..	48
Scholium 1. <i>On the moment of time in which the Church was founded.....</i>	59
Scholium 2. <i>How the concepts of the Kingdom of God and the Church differ</i>	61
Scholium 3. <i>Different meanings of the word “Church”</i>	61
CHAPTER II – On the institution of the monarchic Church	64
ARTICLE I – On the promise of the Primacy made by Christ	64
Thesis 4. Jesus immediately and directly promised to St. Peter a Primacy of jurisdiction or supreme authority over the whole Church	64
Scholium. <i>Proof of the Primacy of St. Peter from Luke 22:32</i>	79
ARTICLE II – Christ conferred the Primacy on St. Peter.....	84
Thesis 5. After his resurrection from the dead Christ the Lord conferred the Primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church directly and immediately on St. Peter.....	84
Scholium 1. <i>The Primacy of St. Peter is confirmed by the judgment of Christian antiquity</i>	90
Scholium 2. <i>Archeological testimony confirms the Primacy of St. Peter</i>	96
ARTICLE III – St. Peter as Vicar of Christ and superior of the Apostles	99
Thesis 6. By reason of the Primacy St. Peter is the true Vicar of Christ on earth, to whom also the other Apostles were subject	99

Scholium. <i>The extraordinary powers of the apostles notwithstanding their subordination to the Primacy of Peter</i>	107
CHAPTER III – On the perpetuity of the Church	110
ARTICLE I – The perpetuity of the Hierarchy of the Church and of the Primacy	110
Thesis 7. The Church as it was instituted by Christ, and in it particularly the Hierarchy and the Primacy, from the will of Christ are perpetual	110
Scholium 1. <i>Proof of the perpetuity from the prophecies of the Old Testament</i> ..	122
Scholium 2. <i>The expectation of Millennarism or Chiliasm</i>	122
ARTICLE II – Bishops are successors of the Apostles	127
Thesis 8. Bishops by divine right succeed the Apostles in their ordinary office; each one of them presides over one particular Church.....	127
Scholium 1. <i>On the use of the words Bishop and Priest</i>	143
Scholium 2. <i>On the mediated or immediate origin from God of the jurisdiction of Bishops</i>	144
ARTICLE III – The Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter in the Primacy	149
Thesis 9. In the perennial Primacy by divine right the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter	149
Scholium 1. <i>The Roman Pontiff by divine right has Primacy over the Church</i> .	163
Scholium 2. <i>The proof of the Primacy is independent of the fact and of the right of the Roman episcopacy of Peter</i>	165
Scholium 3. <i>St. Peter lived in Rome and suffered martyrdom there</i>	165
Scholium 4. <i>The Roman Episcopacy of St. Peter</i>	166
Scholium 5. <i>On the nature of the right by which St. Peter joined the Primacy to the Roman Episcopate</i>	168
ARTICLE IV – On the power and nature or the Primacy	175
Thesis 10. The primatial power of the Supreme Pontiff is universal, ordinary, immediate, truly episcopal, supreme and full, and on earth there is no judgment higher than his	175
Conclusion – The Roman-Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Christ ..	183
Thesis 11. From the demonstrated divine institution and perpetuity of the Church, of the Hierarchy and of the Primacy it is inferred: that the Roman-Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Christ.....	183
BOOK II – On the Magisterium of the Church and its sources	186
CHAPTER I – On the divine institution of the Magisterium	186
SINGLE ARTICLE. The Magisterium was instituted by Christ in the Apostles	186
Thesis 12. Christ the Lord instituted in the Apostles the authentic Magisterium; it is infallible and destined to continue forever	186
CHAPTER II – On the perennial subject of the infallible Magisterium	198
ARTICLE I – The infallibility of Bishops	198
Thesis 13. Bishops, successors of the Apostles, are infallible when in agreement with the Roman Pontiff they impose on the faithful a doctrine to be held definitively, whether in a Council or outside of a Council	198
Scholium 1. <i>On the ecumenical Council</i>	207
Scholium 2. <i>The series of ecumenical Councils</i>	210
Scholium 3. <i>The exercise of the ordinary infallible Magisterium</i>	212

ARTICLE II – The infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff	215
Thesis 14. The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks <i>ex cathedra</i> , possesses the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed the Church to be endowed	215
Scholium 1. <i>Is there one subject of infallibility or two?</i>	232
Scholium 2. <i>Is there one or two ways in which the Pope exercises infallibility..</i>	235
Appendix. Can the Pope as a private person fall into heresy?	240
ARTICLE III – The Authentic Magisterium of the Holy See	241
Thesis 15. Internal and religious assent of the mind is due to the doctrinal decrees of the Holy See authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiff ...	241
Scholium 1. <i>On the nature of the assent that must be given to the decrees, concerning which the thesis deals, according to the opinions of the authors</i>	247
Scholium 2. <i>On the proper object of the assent.</i>	249
CHAPTER III – On the object of the infallible Magisterium	252
ARTICLE I – On the primary object of infallibility	252
Thesis 16. Per se revealed truths are the primary and direct object of the infallible Magisterium	252
ARTICLE II – On the secondary object of infallibility	259
Thesis 17. Other truths that are necessarily connected with the revealed truths are the secondary or indirect object of infallibility	259
CHAPTER IV – On the sources of the Magisterium of the Church	281
ARTICLE I – On the deposit of the faith	281
Thesis 18. Revelation, constituting the object of Catholic faith, was completed with the Apostles.....	281
Scholium 1. <i>Dogmatic progress, even given the impossibility of increasing objective revelation, nevertheless can take place in various ways and does take place</i>	287
Scholium 2. <i>The understanding which the Apostles had of the deposit of faith—was it more perfect than what is had today by the Church, or was it not?</i>	287
ARTICLE II – On the primary source of revelation	293
Thesis 19. The primary source of revelation is the divine tradition of the Apostles, which in antiquity, fullness and sufficiency surpasses Holy Scripture itself.	293
Scholium 1. <i>The argument of prescription</i>	306
Scholium 2. <i>The distinction of the Magisterium from the sources of revelation.</i>	307
CHAPTER V – On the criteria of Tradition	311
ARTICLE I – The holy Fathers are a criterion of Tradition	311
Thesis 20. The consensus of the holy Fathers in matters of faith and morals is a certain criterion of divine Tradition	311
Scholium. <i>Conditions required for a true argument from the consent of the Fathers</i>	318
ARTICLE II – The consensus of Theologians as a criterion of Tradition	323
Thesis 21. The consensus of theologians in matters of faith and morals is a certain criterion of divine Tradition	323

Scholium. <i>On the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas</i>	333
Epilogue – On the value and censure of propositions in Theology	341
Scholium 1. <i>The Councils of Trent and Vatican I intended to define also in the Chapters</i>	352
Scholium 2. <i>The distinction of Vatican I between what must be believed and what must be held</i>	353
Scholium 3. <i>The Vatican canons—do they condemn only heresies in the strict sense?</i>	356
 BOOK III – On the supernatural nature and properties of the Church	359
CHAPTER I – On the supernaturality and eminence of the Church	359
ARTICLE I – On the supernatural end of the Church	359
Thesis 22. The end of the Church is the supernatural sanctification or salvation of men.	359
Scholium 1. <i>The Church is a supernatural society</i>	364
Scholium 2. <i>On the Church as our Mother</i>	365
Scholium 3. <i>There is a twofold end of the Church</i>	366
ARTICLE II – The perfection and absolute independence of the Church	370
Thesis 23. The Church is a perfect and absolutely independent society, with full legislative, judicial and executive power	370
CHAPTER II – On the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and on her members	384
ARTICLE I – The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ	384
Thesis 24. The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ the Head, whose quasi-soul is the Holy Spirit; hence rightly it is called the House of the children of God	384
Scholium 1. <i>The doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas on the Mystical Body of Christ</i>	397
Scholium 2. <i>The doctrine on the Mystical Body in Vatican I</i>	398
Scholium 3. <i>The identity of the Mystical Body with the Roman Catholic Church</i>	400
Scholium 4. <i>On the soul of the Mystical Body</i>	401
Scholium 5. <i>On the relation of the Bl. Virgin Mary with the Mystical Body</i>	403
ARTICLE II – The reason why members of the Church are constituted	407
Thesis 25. Valid Baptism is required and sufficient to constitute members of the Body of the Church	407
Scholium 1. <i>The minimum requirement for someone to become a member of the Church</i>	415
Scholium 2. <i>The mind of Theologians on the Church in the broad sense and in the strict sense</i>	417
ARTICLE III – Reasons that separate a baptized person from the Church	422
Thesis 26. A heretic, apostate and schismatic by the fact itself; and a person excommunicated by legitimate authority are separated from the body of the Church	422
Scholium. <i>The nature of a subject differs from the nature of a member of the Church</i>	431
ARTICLE IV – Holiness and predestination are not of the nature of members of the Church	434

Thesis 27. Neither all nor only the predestined and justified are members of the Body of the Church	434
ARTICLE V – The necessity of the Church for salvation	441
Thesis 28. The Church is necessary for all to obtain eternal salvation, also with a necessity of means	441
Scholium. <i>Infants and adults outside the Church are deprived of heaven in different ways</i>	450
Note: <i>On the reason why men belong to the soul and to the body of the Church</i>	454
CHAPTER III – On the properties and notes of the truth Church	457
ARTICLE I – On the uniqueness and visibility of the Church	457
Thesis 29. Christ instituted his Church as unique and visible, and also as the true Church discernible from false churches	457
ARTICLE II – On the properties of the Church which we profess in the Creed .	471
Thesis 30. Unity, Catholicity, Apostolicity and Holiness are the necessary properties of the Church of Christ	471
ARTICLE III – The four notes distinguishing the true Church	492
Thesis 31. Unity, Catholicity, Apostolicity and Holiness are also the Notes which pertain to the Roman Church alone, and therefore distinguish her as the true Church of Christ from the false ones	492
Scholium 1. <i>An argumentation suited to the mind of Schismatics according to Martin Jugie</i>	515
Excursus – On the Church inasmuch as by itself it is a great motive of credibility	520
Scholium 2. <i>On the Western Schism</i>	521
CHAPTER IV – Recapitulation of the treatise on the Church	524
SINGLE ARTICLE. The threefold power of the Church	524
Thesis 32. Christ the Lord established the threefold power, which he imparted to the Apostles and their successors, namely, of teaching, ruling and sanctifying men, as the primary law of the whole Church	524
Scholium 1. <i>Arguments of the other opinion</i>	537
Scholium 2. <i>On the distinction of the power of the Church in Vatican Council I</i>	541
Scholium 3. <i>The teaching of Father Franzelin on the threefold power</i>	547
Scholium 4. <i>On the true state of the question in this matter</i>	548
CONCLUSION – “Christ in the Church”	551

T R E A T I S E I V

On Holy Scripture

INTRODUCTION	554
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY (n.1-3)	554
– The place of this treatise in fundamental Theology (n.4)	556
– Method of treatment (n.5)	557
– The necessity of Holy Scripture and its excellence (n.6-8)	557
– The object of our treatise (n.9)	558

CHAPTER I – On the inspiration of Holy Scripture.....	559
ARTICLE I – On the fact of inspiration.....	559
Thesis 1. There are books which “having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit have God for their author”	559
ARTICLE II – On the criteria of revelation.....	577
Thesis 2. The universal criterion for recognizing the inspired books, which must be believed with Catholic faith, is the authentic and traditional Magisterium of the Church, based on divine revelation about this matter.....	557
Scholium. <i>Whether an inspired book could be lost</i>	583
ARTICLE III – Summary of the History of the Canon	584
On the canon of the Old Testament	585
Among Jews.....	585
Among Christians	587
On the canon of the New Testament.....	590
ARTICLE IV – On the nature of inspiration.....	594
Inspiration is an extraordinary charism	594
<i>False explanations by defect</i>	595
Thesis 3. The inspiration of the sacred books is not to be explained by their subsequent approbation (I), “nor merely because they contain no admixture of error” (II).....	595
<i>On the constitutive elements of inspiration</i>	598
Thesis 4. Inspiration in the hagiographers consists: a) in the supernatural enlightenment of the intellect to correctly conceive the ideas and the essential nature of the book; b) in the movement of the will to write all those things and only those things which God wills to be written; c) in divine assistance to carry out the work fittingly.....	598
The influence of God on the work of the intellect of the hagiographer.....	600
The influence of God on the will of the hagiographer	603
The influence of God on the production of the book	605
Scholium 1. <i>Whether the hagiographers were always aware of their inspiration</i>	606
Scholium 2. <i>How inspiration and revelation are different</i>	607
Scholium 3. <i>The relation between inspiration and definitions of the Church..</i>	608
ARTICLE V – On the extension of inspiration	609
Thesis 5. The inspiration of the sacred books is extended to all the statements of the hagiographer, even to things mentioned in passing.....	609
In what sense and to what degree are the individual sentences of Scripture said to be the “word of God”	623
On the imprecations	626
Thesis 6. Verbal inspiration in the sense of a “mechanical dictation” is not generally to be admitted.....	629
Thesis 7. The theory of “psychological” verbal inspiration seems to be preferred	634
ARTICLE VI – On the relation of the translations to the inspired originals “autographs”	642
On the authenticity of the Vulgate	642
On the authenticity of other texts.....	651

ARTICLE VII – On the inerrancy of Holy Scripture	653
Thesis 8. All the sentences of Scripture are infallibly true.....	653
On the absolute truth of Holy Scripture and on the literary genres	657
CHAPTER II – On the interpretation of Holy Scripture	671
Hermeneutics and its object.....	671
ARTICLE I – On the sense of Holy Scripture	672
Thesis 9. In Holy Scripture the literal sense must be acknowledged	673
Scholium. <i>The first thing to find is the literal sense</i>	674
Thesis 10. The literal sense of Scripture is unique.....	675
Thesis 11. In Holy Scripture a typical sense must be acknowledge	678
Scholium 1. <i>On the extension of the types</i>	681
Scholium 2 <i>The probative power of the typical sense</i>	682
Scholium 3. <i>Whether the typical sense can be called strictly biblical</i>	682
On the other senses of Holy Scripture.....	683
– The fuller sense	683
– The consequent sense.....	691
– The accommodated sense	691
Scholium 1. <i>A distinction between the historical sense and the Dogmatic sense is not to be admitted</i>	693
Scholium 2. <i>The sense of the hagiographer is always the sense of God</i>	693
ARTICLE II – On the way of finding the sense of Holy Scripture	694
On the dogmatic criteria.....	695
Thesis 12. It belongs to the Church “to judge about the true meaning and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures”	696
Scholium. <i>On the right of the Church of interpreting things which do not pertain to faith and morals</i>	698
How the meaning is known “which Holy Mother the Church has held and holds”	699
CHAPTER III – On the values of Holy Scripture	707
ARTICLE I – On the literary values.....	707
ARTICLE II – The supernatural values in Holy Scripture.....	708
ARTICLE III – On the reading of Holy Scripture	714
Index of Holy Scripture	720
Index of names	737
Index of subjects	759

THEOLOGICAL NOTES

USED IN THIS "SACRAE THEOLOGIAE SUMMA"

Divine faith (de fide divina): what is contained in the word of God written or handed down. The opposite is: *an error in faith (error in fide)*.

Divine and catholic faith (de fide divina et catholica): what is contained in the word of God written or handed and is proposed by the Church either by a solemn judgment or by the ordinary and universal Magisterium to be believed as divinely revealed. The opposite is: *heresy*.

Defined divine and catholic faith (de fide divina et catholica definita): what is contained in the word of God written or handed down and is proposed by the Church by a solemn judgment, that is, by the infallible Magisterium, exercised in an extraordinary way, either in an ecumenical council or by the Roman Pontiff speaking "ex cathedra" and to be believed as divinely revealed. [N.B. Even the Chapter Titles in Trent and Vatican I are considered as true *definitions*.]

Proximate to faith (fidei proxima): a truth that by an almost unanimous agreement of theologians is contained in the word of God written or handed down. The opposite is: *proximate to error or heresy*.

Faith based on the authority of the Church (fides ecclesiastica): a truth not formally revealed, which is proposed infallibly by the Magisterium of the Church. The opposite is: *error in ecclesiastical faith*. [Those who do not admit there is such a thing as ecclesiastical faith give a different theological note for such a truth.]

Catholic doctrine (doctrina catholica): a truth that is taught in the whole Church, but not always proposed infallibly (for example, what the Roman Pontiffs wish to teach explicitly in encyclical letters). The opposite is: *error in catholic doctrine*.

Theologically certain (theologie certa): a truth that in the theological schools is certainly recognized as necessarily connected with revealed truths; this connection can be either virtual or presupposition or final. The opposite is: *error in theology*.

A doctrine to be so held that its contrary is temerarious (doctrina ita tenenda, ut contraria sit temeraria): a truth proposed by the Roman Congregations, which proposition however does not enjoy the special approbation of the Roman Pontiff.

Common and certain in theology (communis et certa in theologia): what by the common agreement of theologians is taught in the schools as well founded. The opposite is: *false in theology, temerarious*.

Probable (probabilis): a theological opinion with a lesser grade of certainty.

ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	Acta Apostolicae Sedis
ASS	Acta Sanctae Sedis
Ang	Angelicum
Ant	Antonianum
ArchPh	Archives de Philosophie
ArchTG	Archivo Teológico Granadino
ASS	Acta Sanctae Sedis
Bibl.....	Biblica
BiblZeitschr	Biblische Zeitschrift
BullLitEccl.....	Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique
BullThom.....	Bulletin Thomiste
CathBiblQuart.....	The Catholic Biblical Quarterly
Cav	F. Cavallera, S.I., Thesaurus Doctrinae Catholicae
CE.....	Ch. G. Herbermann and associates, The Catholic Encyclopedia
CIC.....	Codex Iuris Canonici
CiencFe.....	Ciencia y Fe
CiencTom.....	La Ciencia Thomista
CivCatt.....	La Civiltà Cattolica
CL	Acta et Decreta sacrorum Conciliorum Recentiorum Collectio Lacensis
CollatBrug	Collationes Brugenses
CSEL.....	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum Academiae Vindobonensis
CTr	Concilium Tridentinum. Ed. Societas Goerresiana
CyF.....	Ciencia y Fe
D.....	H. Denzinger –P. Hünermann, Enchiridion Symbolorum ⁴³
DACL.....	F. Carrol – H. Leclercq- H. Marrou, Dictionnaire d'Archeologie chrétienne et de Liturgie
DAFC.....	A. d'Ales, Dictionnaire Apologétique de la Foi Catholique
DB	F. Vigouroux, Dictionnaire de la Bible
DBS.....	L. Pirot-A. Robert, Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément
DivThom (Fr)	Divus Thomas. Freiburg i. der Schweiz
DivThom (Pi).....	Divus Thomas. Piacenza
DocCath.....	La Documentation Catholique
DocComm.....	Doctor Communis
DomSt.....	Dominican Studies
DTC	A. Vacant-E. Mangenot-E. Amann, Dictionnaire de Théologie catholique

EB	Enchiridion Biblicum ²
EC	Enchiridion Clericorum
EchOr.....	Echos d'Orient
EphRhLov.....	Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses
EstBibl	Estudios Biblicos
EstEcl.....	Estudios Ecclesiasticos
EstFranc	Estudios Franciscanos
Et.....	Etudes
EtCarm.....	Etudes Carmelitaines
GChS.....	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter- Commission der Königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
Greg	Gregorianum
Hrd	J. Harduini, S.I., Conciliorum Collectio regia maxima
JThSt.....	The Journal of Theological Studies
Kch.....	C. Kirch, S.I.-L. Ueding, S.I., Enchiridion Fontium historiae ecclesiasticae antiquae ⁵
LTK	M. Buchberger, Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche
Manr.....	Manresa
ML, MG.....	J. P. Migne, Patrologiae cursus completus Series prima latina. Series graeca.
MiscCom... ..	Miscellanea Comillas
Msi	J. D. Mansi, Sacrorum Conciliorum nova et amplissima collection
NeuStGeschThK.....	Neue Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie Der Kirche
NouvRevTh	Nouvelle Revue Théologique
OrChP	Orientalia Christiana Periodica
Pens.....	Pensamiento
R.....	M. J. Rouët de Journel, S.I., Enchiridion Patristicum ¹⁸
RazFe	Razón y Fe
RechScRel	Recherches de Science Religieuse
REPT.....	J. J. Herzog, Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche
RevBén	Revue Bénédictine
RevBibl.....	Revue Biblique
RevEspT	Revista Española de Teología
RevHist	Revue Historique
RevHistEccl.....	Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique
RevHistPhRel	Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses
RevHistLittRel.....	Revue d'Histoire et de Littérature Religieuse

RevNéoscolPh	Revue Néo-scholastique de Philosophie
RevScPhTh	Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques
RevScRel	Revue des Sciences Religieuses
RevThom	Revue Thomiste
RGG	Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart
Sap	Sapienza
Schol	Scholastik
ScriptVict	Scriptorium Victorienne
ScuoCatt	Scuola Cattolica
SitzKPAkadWiss	Sitzungsberichte der königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
SThS	Sacrae Theologiae Summa
Stimm	Stimmen (aus Maria-Laach; ab anno 1915: der Zeit)
ThGl	Theologie und Glaube
ThLitZg	Theologische Literatur Zeitung
ThPraktQschr	Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift
ThRev	Theologische Revue
ThStKrit	Theologische Studien und Kritik
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VerDom	Verbun Domini
VerVid	Verdad y Vida
ZkathTh	Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte
ZNTWiss	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche

TREATISE III

ON THE CHURCH
OF CHRIST

by
Joachim Salaverri, S.J.

Translated from Latin by
Kenneth Baker, S.J.

INTRODUCTION

H. Dieckmann, *De ecclesia* (1925) I n.1-19; M. D'Herbigny, *Theologia De ecclesia* (1927) I n.1-5; R. Schultes, *De ecclesia* (1925) c.1; A.C. Cotter, *Theologia Fundamental* (1940) Introd. 1-21; J. De Guibert, *De Christi Ecclesia* (1928) n.1-19; J. Bilz, *Einführung in die Theologie* (1935); M. Jugie, *Où se trouve le Christanisme intégral* (1947); Ch. Journet, *Introduction à la Théologie* (1948); B.M. Xiberta, *Introductio in sacram theologiam* (1940); A. Lang, *Fundamental theologie*, Bd. I (1954) p.2-32.

1) The connection of this treatise with the treatises which are presupposed. The treatise on the true Church of Christ according to correct methodology supposes that the students have already covered the treatises *On Revealed Religion* and *On Christ the Divine Legate*.

For, the Church says that she has been instituted by Christ to guard and propagate Christian revelation. Hence two questions present themselves: 1) Is revelation possible? 2) Has revelation really taken place?

2. The treatise *On Revealed Religion* responds to the first question, by showing that the possibility and knowability of a religion divinely revealed is not impossible. The treatise *On Christ the Divine Legate* satisfies the second question, since it proves that Jesus Christ, as the true Legate of God, has de facto handed on revealed Religion to men.

3. That having been proved, a further question arises about the form under which the Religion revealed by Christ de facto has been established.

For, *a priori* revealed Religion can be conceived as established in many different forms, and de facto the different sects in various ways have claimed that they were established by Christ. However, since revealed Religion is a positive institution, which depends on the free will of the institutor, therefore it is necessary to inquire into the form and constitution, which Christ de facto gave his Religion. This is the proper inquiry of the treatise *On the Church of Christ*, as Leo XIII said in his encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" D 3302).

4. But two conclusions can be drawn from this inquiry: 1) that the Roman Catholic Church is the true religious institution to which Christ entrusted his revelation to be guarded and propagate; 2) that the intimate constitution and nature of Christ's Church is truly supernatural.

5. The method. The first conclusion is mainly apologetic, while the second is dogmatic; therefore it is necessary to present the treatise on the Church to a certain extent *by the apologetic method*, and to a certain extent

by the *dogmatic method*. By the apologetic method the fact is established, while by the dogmatic method the intimate nature of that fact is penetrated.

6. Surely it is true that the Church is one of the articles of faith which we profess when we say: "I believe the holy Catholic Church" (D 30); and therefore all the questions concerning her can be treated dogmatically. But before we can argue dogmatically, it is necessary to establish the foundation upon which all dogmatic theology is built. But the *foundation* of dogmatic theology is the doctrinal authority of the Church, which has been commissioned by God to guard and infallibly declare the doctrine of faith and morals contained in the sources of revelation. Therefore, first of all, this must be proved in an apologetic way, and we will attempt to prove it by developing the first conclusion of our inquiry.

However, for the sake of information, we will also carefully point out what the *dogmatic teaching of the Church* for each of the theses; we will cite the documents of the Church's Magisterium, in which she teaches the theses, and from that we will give the *theological note*, that is, the grade of theological certitude according to which the Church proposes that the individual theses must be held by the faithful.

7. Within the apologetic method a *threefold way* is especially recommended in order to show which church is the true Church of Christ, the guardian and teacher of Christian revelation.

The way is said to be *empirical* which proceeds from a consideration of the Catholic Church according as it is open to the observation of all of us. For when the existence and life of the Catholic Church is observed in the concrete, it is apparent that it is a true moral miracle. Hence it is immediately inferred that the Church in herself manifests the divine seal, which really is the proof of her claim of her own infallibility and "and irrefutable testimony of her divine mission" (D 3013).

8. We see that this empirical way was already pointed out by St. Augustine,¹ by St. Thomas,² by Suarez,³ by St. R. Bellarmine.⁴ The authors especially in the 19th century who wrote Apologies for the Christian religion developed this empirical way. That is the case with Balmes, and especially with Victor Augustus Dechamps (+ 1883), who uses

1. St. Augustine, *De fide rerum quae non videntur* 4,7: ML 40,176; *De civitate Dei* 22,5: ML 41,756; CSEL 40,2,589. See R 1614,1783.

2. S.Th. I CG 6.

3. F. Suarez, *De fide* d.4 s.3 n.11.

4. St. Robert Bellarmine, *Controversiae* 4 l.4 c.6-12.

this argument as the center of his apologetic work and developed in more than others.⁵

9. Vatican Council I recommended this empirical way in the *Dogmatic Constitution on Catholic Faith* (D 2939-3014); the determination of its final form was entrusted to Cardinal Dechamps himself along with two other Fathers of the council—the bishops of Poitiers and Paderborn. The theologian, whom these three used in order to complete this work, was Fr. Joseph Kleutgen, who in his treatise, *Theologie der Vorzeit*, had already proposed this teaching about the Church as a sign of her credibility.⁶

Concerning this empirical way, theologians had this to say about the proposed text of the Vatican Council: “in her (the Church), besides the scientific inquiries, which by far many persons are not able to follow, even the uneducated have an easily understandable summary of the motives of credibility to reach full certitude, which can be confirmed through the apologetic disciplines by a more distinct and ample explanation.”⁷

After the First Vatican Council H. Dieckmann brilliantly developed this empirical way of argumentation.⁸ A brief summary of the argument is given by L. Lercher⁹ as the crown of the treatise on Christ the divine Legate, and J. de Guibert does the same.¹⁰ In the treatise *On Christian Revelation* in volume IA of this series you will find this doctrine in theses 37 to 40.

14. Another way is the *illative*, which generally is called *the way of the notes*. This apologetic way is distinguished only inadequately from the *historical way*. For, from the historical sources certain things are deduced which are her properties and with which Christ willed his Church to be endowed; therefore they must pertain to the true Church of Christ. But since certain of these necessary properties are found also to be visible and easily recognizable, they are deservedly called *notes*, by which the true Church of Christ can be distinguished from the false ones, which are found to be lacking in those same notes. Rightly, therefore, this way by the authors is called the *historical-illative way*, because presupposing a certain historical demonstration as its foundation, it infers logically therefrom which Church is the true Church of Christ.

5. V.A. Dechamps, *De la certitudine en matière de religion religieuse résolue par les faits. Entretiens sur la démonstration catholique. Le libre examen de la vérité de la foi: Oeuvres*, t.1-4. See R. Aubert, *Le problème de l'acte de foi* (1945) 142-145; J. Balmes, *El Protestantismo* c.3.

6. Msi 53,161; CL 7,1647. See M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* 269. M.J. Bliguet, *L'Apologétique traditionnelle... au Conc. Du Vatican*: RevScPhTh 18 (1929) 243-262. On the doctrine of Fr. Kleutgen, see H. Lange, *Alois von Schmid und die vatikanische Lehre von Glaubensabfall*: Schol 2 (1927) 342-379; F. Lakner, *Kleutgen und die kirchliche Wissenschaft*: ZkathTh 57 (1933) 161-214; R. Schlund, *Zur Quellenfrage der vatikanischen Lehre von der Kirche als Glaubwürdigkeitsgrund*: ZkathTh 72 (1950) 443-459.

7. Msi 50,93; CL 7,533.

8. H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.594-631; *ibid.* n.631,6-10, several authors are cited, who work out the same argument very clearly.

9. L. Lercher, *Institutiones Theologicae* I n.224-256.

10. J. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.20-36.

11. The third way is the *historical*, by which, according to scientific inquiries, with a more distinct and ample historical explanation it is demonstrated that the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, the custodian and teacher of the revealed word (D 3537-3542).

This historical method is especially suited to the subject with which it is dealing. For, as in the Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" Leo XIII says: "Not the foundation of the Church alone, but her whole constitution belongs to the class of things effected by Christ's *free choice*. For this reason the entire case must be judged by what was actually done" (D 3302). Therefore, if the Church's foundation, form, purpose and functions are all historical facts, the conclusion must be that all of them can be demonstrated scientifically with the historical method. But the historical demonstration is based on the testimonies, whether formal or virtual, which are made available by the genuine sources, after they have been proved critically to be integral.

12. On the sources of the treatise. We can use in an apologetic way the books of the *Old Testament*, inasmuch as in them the religion of the Jews is described and the expectation of the Jewish of a Messiah and a messianic Kingdom is manifested. The principal *sources* for our purpose are the sacred books of the *New Testament* and their treatment of the first Christian age, which we now suppose as genuine, integral and critically proven from the treatises on the Introduction to Holy Scripture and to Patrology.

However, we are using them as *historical sources*: that is, methodically we are abstracting from the sacred and inspired character of the canonical books, and from the religious authority, which pertains to the testimonies of the holy Fathers of the Church, although we in no way deny them; and we will question them and subject them to examination as historical sources, according to the wise teaching of Leo XIII:

"But since the divine and infallible Magisterium of the Church rests also on the authority of Holy Scripture, the first thing to be done is to vindicate the trustworthiness of the sacred records at least as human documents, from which can be clearly proved, as from primitive and authentic testimony, the Divinity and mission of Christ our Lord, the institution of a hierarchical Church and the primacy of Peter and his successors" (Encyclical "*Providentissimus*": EB 101).

13. Among the sources a singular importance is attached to the books of the gospels and especially to the Gospel of St. Matthew. Matthew of course wrote his gospel in Aramaic; but his Greek text enjoys supreme authority. For, the Fathers and all the ecclesiastical authors, indeed the Church herself already from her first beginnings used, as a canonical book, the Greek text; from this we conclude that the Greek gospel is es-

sententially identical with the Aramaic gospel composed by the same Matthew (D 3562, 3565). (See S. Rosadini, *Instit. introd. In N.T.*, vol.1, n.118ff.).

The Gospel of St. Matthew really can be called the Gospel of the Kingdom of God and of the Church of Christ. From this point of view, it can be divided into two parts¹¹:

The first part: *Christ preaches the Kingdom of God to the people of Israel* (Matt. 1:1-16).

1) The coming of the Messiah and announcing the Kingdom of God (1:1-4.16).

2) The promulgation of the New Law to all the people of Israel and the confirmation by miracles of his divine origin (4:17—9:35);

3) The choice of Christ's Apostles and a pastoral instruction (9:36—11:1);

4) Jesus, with the cooperation of the Apostles, labors in vain to be acknowledged by the people of Israel (11:2—12:45);

5) Jesus begins to withdraw himself from the people, while he describes for the people the nature of the Kingdom of God in parables, which he explains only for his disciples, and finally he leaves the people who reject him (12:46—16:12).

14. The second part: *Christ established his Church with the people of Israel opposing him* (16:13—28:20).

1) Jesus in the presence of his disciples chooses Peter as the foundation of his Church, and he appoints the Apostles as pastors (16:13—20:34);

2) Jesus explicitly rejects the people of Israel, and he predicts the destruction of the temple and the future fate of the Church (21:1—25:46);

3) Jesus established a new covenant with his own blood, which he seals forever by his death (26—27);

4) Finally, Jesus by his resurrection, thus proving his divine mission, hands over to his Apostles the fullness of power (28).

15. Therefore by the divine authority of Christ given to the Church are:

1) The New Law of perfection and charity (Matt. 5:1-48);

2) The hierarchical-monarchical subject of authority (Matt. 10:1-42; 18:1-35; 16:13-20);

3) The fullness of power over all men (Matt. 28:16-20).

16. *Of the holy Fathers* as principally to be mentioned are Clement of Rome, Ignatius of Antioch, Irenaeus of Lyons, Cyprian, in his work, *De Catholicae Ecclesiae unitate*, and St. Augustine, especially in his treatises *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae*, *De utilitate credendi* and *De unitate*

11. See J.M. Bover, *El Evangelio de S. Mateo* (1946) p.19-38. J. Huby, *L'Evangile et les Evangiles* (1954) p.99-133. The division of Holy Scripture into chapters, at the beginning of the 13th century, was introduced by the University of Paris, the work of Stephen Langton. But in the editions of the Latin version of both Testaments the division further into verses, which is now used, was introduced by Robert Stephanus in the year 1555. Pontifical Biblical Institute, *Institutiones Biblicae* Introd. n.6, and 1.3, on the Text, n.121 and 125. See A. Vaccari, *El estudio de la Sagrada Escritura* (1944) 103.

*Ecclesiae.*¹²

17. *From the Magisterium of the Church:* Vatican Council I, sess.IV, the *Constitution on the Church of Christ* (D 3050-3075); Leo XIII, Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*"; Pius XI, Encyclical "*Quas primas*" and "*Mortalium animos*"; finally, Pius XII, Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis Christi*" offer us a more abundant teaching about the Church.

The dogmatic value of Vatican I, as infallible, is supreme; on the dogmatic value of the teaching of Encyclicals, what must be held is what Pius XII taught in his Encyclical, "*Humani generis*": "Nor must it be thought that what is expressed in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say: 'He who hears you, hears me'; and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiff, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians."¹³

18. *Of the theologians, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure* and other great theologians surely treated many questions concerning the Church, however they did not compose a systematic treatise in which they considered the whole doctrine about the Church.¹⁴ After James of Viterbo (+ 1307) in his incomplete work, *De regimine christiano*, the first one to write a systematic treatise was Io. de Turrecremata (+ 1468), *Summa de Ecclesia*. Among the important theologians after Trent similar treatises on the Church were written, but they were included in other theological treatises: thus within the treatise *On the Faith*, Suarez, Tanner, Billuart; in *Commentaries on the Summa*, Báñez, Toletus and other commentators on the *Summa* of

12. You will find Saints Clement and Ignatius in F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* I; St. Irenaeus in MG 7; St. Cyprian in ML 4,405-520 and CSEL 3,1,207-233; the treatises of St. Augustine in ML 32,1309-1344; 42,65-92 and CSEL 25,1,1-48; ML 43,391-446 and CSEL 52,229-322.

13. See the Encyclicals of Leo XIII "*Satis cognitum*" and of Pius XII "*Mystici Corporis*" in ASS 28 (1896) 708-739 and AAS 35 (1943) 193-248. But for the Encyclicals of Pius XI "*Quas primas*" and "*Mortalium animos*," see AAs 17 (1925) 593-600, and 20 (1928) 5-16. For the Encyclical of Pius XII "*Humani generis*": AAS 42 (1950) 568; see J. Salaverri, *Valor de las Enciclicas a la luz de la "Humani generis"*: MiscCom 17(1952) 137-171.

14. St. Thomas treats several questions about the Church, especially in the *Summa* II-II, q. 1 a. 10 and III, q. 8; in 4 CG 76; in 2 d.44 q.2 a.3; in 3 d.13; in 4 d.24; *De ver.* q. 29 a.4; *Quodl.* 9 a.16; in Opusc., according to the edition of 1570 on Romans 3:19 and 20; *De rationibus fidei*; *Contra impugnantes cultum Dei* c.3 and 4; *De regimine Principum*, up to 1.2 c.4, for the rest of this little work seems not to have been written by St. Thomas; *Comment.* on the Gospels of Matt. and John, and also on all the epistles of St. Paul. See M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl. Thomas von der Kirche* (1903).

Of the works of St. Bonaventure the following can be consulted: *De perf. evang.* q.2 a.1 and 2; q.4 a.3; *Brevilog.* P.6 c.10 and 12; in 4 d.18 p.2 q.3; d.19 a.2 q.2 and 3 q.1; d.20 p.2 q.3 c, ad 1 and 2; q.5 ad 4; q.6 arg.6; d.25 a.1 q.1; q.2 ad 3 and ad 4; in *Exaem.* Coll.22 n.15.

Aquinas.¹⁵ But all of these treatises develop the questions about the Church according to the dogmatic method. Monographic treatises against the Protestants can be added to the preceding, like that of Cajetan, *De divina institutione Pontificatus Romani Pontificis* (1521) and some others; you can see some of these edited critically in the *Corpus Catholicorum*.

19. General bibliography. *With the apologetic method* the first ones to treat the Church were Melchior Cano, O.P. (+ 1560), in his treatise *De locis*, 1.4-6; Th. Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctrinalium demonstratio methodica* (1581); and especially St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J. (+ 1621) in his *Controversiis*, 3rd to 5th (edit. Vivès, 1870).

20. By more recent authors, those to be specially recommended are:

1) *As classics:*

Passaglia, C., S.J., *De ecclesia Christi* (1854).

Schrader, C., S.J., *De unitate Romana* (1862-66).

Franzelin, I.B., Card., S.J., *Theses de Ecclesia* (1887).

Palmieri, D., S.J., *De Rom. Pontifice*. Prolegom. *De Ecclesia* (1902).

Ottiger, I., S.J., *Theologia Fundamentalis*. II de *Ecclesia Christi* (1911).

Straub, A., S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi* (1912).

Subsidiarily can be added:

Granderath, Th., S.J., *Constitutiones dogmaticae sacrosancti oecumenici Concilii Vaticani* (1892).

Grabmann, M., *Die Lehre des h. Thomas von der Kirche* (1903).

21. 2) As excellent especially by reason of the method and erudition:

Dieckmann, H., S.J., *De Ecclesia* (1925).

D'Herbigny, M., S.J., *Theologica de Ecclesia* (1927).

22. As those who treat the matter extensively and solidly:

Mazzella, C., Card., S.J., *De religione et Ecclesia* (1892).

Pesch, Ch., S.J., *Institutiones propaedeuticae* (1894).

Wilmers, G., S.J., *De Christi Ecclesia* (1897).

Segna, F., Card., *De Ecclesia Christi* (1900).

De San, L., S.J., *Tractatus de Ecclesia* (1906).

15. I. de Viterbe, *De regimine christiano* (1301-1302; ed. H.X. Arquilliere; I. De Currecremata, *Summa de Ecclesia* (Venice 1561); F. Suarez, *De fide* d.5 and 9-11; A. Tanner, *De fide* q.3-4; Ch. R. Billuart, *De regulis fidei* diss.3-5.

Commentators on the *Summa* of St. Thomas develop questions on the Church especially in II-II, q.1 a.10 and in 3 q.8: Thus f. de Victoria, Th. de Vio Caietanus, D. Báñez, F. Toletus, G. de Valencia, G. Vázquez, and others. For the ecclesiological works of the Brothers of the Order of Preachers from the year 1234 up to 1929, see A. Bacic: *Ang 6* (1929) 279-324. See J. Salaverri, *La ecclesiología de Francisco Suarez*: *Actas del IV Centenario del nacimiento de Francisco Suarez* (Burgos 1949) 2,39-54.

Schultes, R.J., O.P., *De Ecclesia Catholica* (1925).
 Billot, L., Card., S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi* (1927).
 Dorsch, Ae., S.J., *Institutiones Theologiae Fundamentaliss. II De Ecclesia* (1928).
 Vellico, A., O.F.M., *De Ecclesia Christi* (1940).
 Zapelena, T., S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi*, I (1950), II (1954).

23. 4) As those who treat the matter more succinctly for the use of students:

Van Noort, G., *Tractatus de Ecclesia Christi* (1909).
 Reinhold, G., *Theologia fundamentalis* (1915).
 Felder, H., O.M.C., *Apologetica. II De Ecclesia Christi* (1923).
 Bainvel, J.V., S.J., *De Ecclesia Christi* (1925); Id., *De Magisterio vivo et Traditione* (1905).
 Zubizarreta, V., O. Carm., *Theologia fundamentalis* (1925).
 Michelitsch, A., *Elementa Apologeticae* (1925).
 Guibert, J. de, S.J., *De Christi Ecclesia* (1928).
 Tanquerey, A., *De vera Religione et Ecclesia*²⁴ (1937).
 Lercher, L., Schlagenhaupt, F., S.J., *Institutiones Theologiae*, I³ (1939).
 Stolz, A., O.S.B., *De Ecclesia* (1939).
 Cotter, A.C., S.J., *Theologia fundamentalis* (1940).
 Parente, P., *Theologia fundamentalis* (1946).
 Calcagno, F.X., S.J., *Theologia fundamentalis* (1948).
 Hervé, J.M., *De Revelatione. De Ecclesia* (1949).
 Baisi, C., *De Revelatione. De Ecclesia. De Verbo Dei* (1949).
 Denis, L., S.J., *De vera religione. De Ecclesia Christi* (1950).

24. 5) As those who can use vernacular languages:

Bruders, H., S.J., *Die Verfassung der Kirche* (1904).
 Dublanchy, E., DTC: *Eglise* (1911).
 Briere, Y. de la, S.J., DAFC: *Eglise* (1914).
 Dunin-Borkowski, St.v., S.J., *Die Kirche als Stiftung Jesu* (1923).
 Poulpique, A., O.P., *L'Eglise Catholique* (1923).
 Brunsmann, J., S.V.D., *Kirche und Gottesglaube* (1926).
 Medebielle, A., DBS 2: *Eglise* (1934).
 Jacquemet, G., *Tu es Petrus: Encyclopédie sur la Papauté* (1934).
 Colomer, L., O.F.M., *La Iglesia católica* (1934).
 Lippert, P., S.J., *Die Kirche Christi* (1935).
 Koster, L., S.J., *Die Kirche unseres Glauben* (1938).
 Journet, Ch., *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné: I. Hierarchie apostolique* (1941);
 II. Sa structure interne et sa unité catholique (1951).
 Algermissen, C., *La chiesa e le chiese* (1944).
 Siri, G., *La Chiesa* (1944).
 Tysiewicz, S., S.J., *La sainteté de l'Eglise christoconforme* (1945).
 Bardy, G., *La théologie de l'Eglise: I De Saint Clément de Rom à Saint Irénée*

(1945); II. *De Saint Irénée au concile de Nicée* (1947).
 Kerkvoorde, A., O.S.B., *Le Mystère de l'Eglise* (1946).
 Jugie, M., A.A., *Où se trouve le Christianisme intégral* (1947).
 Philips, G., *La sainte Eglise Catholique* (1947).
 Cerfaux, L., *La Théologie de l'Eglise suivant saint Paul* (1948).
 Aigrain, R., *Ecclesia, Encyclopédie* (1948).
 Montcheuil, Y.de., S.J., *Aspects de l'Eglise* (1949).
 Brinktrine, J., *Existenz der Offenbarung: Die Kirche* (1949).
 Corbishley, Th., *Roman Catholicism* (1950).
 Congar, Y.M.-J., O.P., *Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Eglise* (1950); Id., *Esquisses du Mystère de l'Eglise* (1953); Id., *Jalons pour une Théologie du Laïc* (1953).
 Lubac, H. de, S.J., *Méditation sur l'Eglise* (1953).
 Semmelroth, O., S.J., *Die Kirche als Ursakrament* (1953).
 Beni-Cipriani, A.S., *La vera Chiesa* (1953).
 García Martínez, F., *Naturaleza jurídica y derechos de la Iglesia* (1954).
 Lang, A., *Fundamentaltheologie* (1954).
 Beauduin, L., O.S.B. (Etudes offerts à), *L'Eglise et L'Eglises: 1054-1954* (1954).
Marie et l'Eglise, 3 vol. (works of several authors): *Etudes Mariales* (1951-1953).
 Coathalem, H., S.J., *Le parallélisme entre la S. Vierge et l'Eglise* (1954).
 Riedmann, A., *Die Wahrheit über die Kirche Jesu* (1953).

25. These can be recommended as collections of sources:

Rauschen, G., *Textus anteniceni ad Primatum Romanum spectantes* (1914).
 Mirbt, C., *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums* (1924).
 Madoz, J., S.J., *I La Iglesia: Fuentes y Documentos* 1935). II *El Primado: Fuentes y Documentos* (1936).
 Giles, E., *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority* (1952).

26. The following explain the opinions of non-Catholics:

1) Of separated Orientals:

Gordillo, M., S.J., *Compendium Theologiae Orientalis* (1939).
 Spacil, Th., S.J., *Doctrina Orientis separati de Ecclesia: OrCh* 1 (1923) 33-72; 2 (1924) 37-132.
 Jugie, M., A.A., *Theol. dogmat. Christianorum Orientalium*. IV. *Theologia Graeco-Russorum de Ecclesia* (1931). V. *Theol. Nestorianorum et Monophysitarum* (1935).
 Heiler, F., *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937).
 Tysiewicz, S., S.J., *Doctrinae de Ecclesia theologorum russorum* (1937).

2) Of Protestants and rationalists:

Dieckmann, H., S.J., *De Ecclesia* n.543-571, 385-387.135f.
 D'Herbigny, M., S.J., *Theol. De Ecclesia* n.35.

Linton, O., *Das Problem der Urkirche in der neuere Forschung* (1932).

Braun, F.M., O.P., *Aspects nouveaux du problème de l'Eglise* (1942).

Algermissen, C., *La chiesa e le chiese* (1944).

Cullmann, O., *S.Pierre, Disciple-Apôtre-Martyr* (1952).

3) Of Modernists:

Pius X, Encyclical "*Pascendi*," the Decree "*Lamentabili*" (1907): D 3401-3500.

Rivière, J., *Qui rédige l'Encycl. "Pascendi"*: BulLitEccl 47 (1946) 143-161, 242f.

The principal redactor of the Encyclical seems to have been J. Lemius, O.M.I.

Heiner, F.X., *Der neue Syllabus* (1908), *Die Massregeln Pius X gegen den Modernismus* (1910).

Rossa, E., S.J., *L'Encyclica "Pascendi"* (1909).

Carbone, C., *De modernistarum doctrinis* (1909).

Vermeersch, A., S.J., *De Modernismo* (1910).

Mausbach, J., *Der Eid wider den Modernismus und die katholische Wissenschaft* (1911).

Bessmer, J., *Philosophie und Theologie des Modernismus* (1912).

Modernisme: DAFC 3 (1916) 591-695; DTC 10 (1929) 2009-2047.

Rivière, J., *Le modernisme dans l'Eglise Catholique* (1929).

Lagrange, M.N., O.P., *Loisy et le Modernisme* (1932).

Reinhard, W., *Modernismus*: LTK 7 (1935) 249-254.

Fabro, C., *Modernismo*: EciclCatt 8 (1952) 1188-1196.

Lilley, A.L., *Modernism*: EncRelEth 8 (1930) 763-769 (appraisal of Protestants).

4) Opinions of ecumenists or pan-Christians:

Congar, Y.M.-J., O.P., *Chrétiens désunés* (1937).

Etudes oecuméniques du Concil oecuménique des Eglises: Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu (Documents de l'Assemblée d'Amsterdam, 1948) 5 vol. (1949).

Karrer, O., *Um die Einheit der Christen*: Ein Gespräch mit E. Brunner, O.

Cullmann, H. V. Campenhausen (1953).

Hanahoe, E.F., *Catholic Ecumenism* (1953).

29. Opinions about the Church. The principal opinions of non-Catholics concerning the nature of the Church.

1) *The separated Orientals* acknowledge the divine, hierarchical institution of the Church. They dissent from the Catholic Church precisely because they deny the monarchical constitution of the Church, that is, the Primacy of jurisdiction and infallibility, and they concede only a Primacy of honor to the Roman See.

2) *Gallicans* admit the divine institution and its juridical Primacy. However, they place a limit on the primatial power, subordinating it to the Ecumenical Council, or only the more important parts do not attribute to

it the full plenitude of jurisdiction, and they affirm that the decrees of the Holy See are not irreformable unless they receive the approval of the whole Church.

3) *The first Protestants*, holding that Christ instituted the Church, deny that he gave it a definite constitution, or at least they refuse to admit any Primacy, and they do not recognize the authority of the Church to interpret authentically the sources of revelation.

4) *Rationalists*, denying the supernatural order, do concede that a certain religious movement was started by Christ; but they hold that the Church takes its origin from natural causes among the followers of Christ, and under the influence of the religious ideas of that time that it evolved logically according to general laws. However, the external form of the Church is in no way from Christ. *Naturalists* say the same thing.

5) *Modernists* explain the matter like this: Christ, since he thought that the end of the world was near, could not think about establishing a church; but it can be said to have been founded by him indirectly, inasmuch as the Church is nothing else but a part of the collective awareness of those to whom Christ communicated his faith or religious experience. Therefore, from this collective awareness, in virtue of the law of vital permanence, the organization and authority of the Church necessarily resulted, and from that same awareness, in virtue of the law of vital evolution, the Church must be adapted to the different conditions of the ages.

30. Catholic doctrine holds that Christ Jesus, by divine authority, established the Church as a religious society, external and visible, hierarchical, monarchical, to continue perpetually; that he endowed it with a Teaching Authority that is also infallible, in order to be the authentic guardian and teacher of the revealed word; finally, that he gave her a fixed nature and assigned her an end of the supernatural order that it might be for men a home of holiness and an ark of salvation. This true Church of Christ is the holy, catholic, apostolic and one Roman Church (D 3001).

31. A preceding question. Since the treatise on the Church intends to prove this Catholic doctrine, this preceding question presents itself: In order to draw this conclusion, is it sufficient to presuppose that Christ was only a Divine Legate, or is it also necessary to have proved that he was really the Son of God?

Catholic authors generally hold that it suffices to presuppose that Christ was a true Legate of God. However many think that several questions arise in this treatise, especially concerning the intimate nature and character of the Church, which cannot be fully understood unless the divinity of Christ is presupposed to have been proven; but the sources, on the basis of which we argue, express the divinity of Christ as the foundation

of the institution of the Church; wherefore, they conclude, although it is not strictly necessary, still it would be better beforehand to prove the divinity of Christ, both in order to establish more fully and firmly the foundation of the whole treatise, and also because of greater fidelity to the sources themselves. For, a mere Prophet, even if he is the greatest, cannot speak in such a way that he places himself on the same level and makes himself clearly equal to God, as the sources testify that Christ often did (Matt. 5:43f.; 10:37-39; 16:18.19; 25:31-40; 28:18-20).

32. There is no obstacle in the fact that the divinity of Christ is an absolute mystery and a dogma of faith, which for that reason must be proved dogmatically. For, it is really proved dogmatically in treatises on the Trinity and on the Incarnate Word; but it is very helpful also to establish in an apologetic way the truth of his testimony, which he gave concerning his own divinity, because, since it is a truth of the greatest importance, it is necessary to demonstrate it in every possible way.

33. In quite explicit words Leo XIII said that the divinity of Christ can be proved apologetically; he said that in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" when he wrote: "Jesus Christ proved *his divinity and his divine Mission* by the power of his miracles" (Ass 28,716), and in his Encyclical "*Providentissimus*," when he stated: "From the books of Holy Scripture as from the most reliable witnesses of antiquity the divinity and mission of Christ the Lord... are affirmed clearly and certainly" (EB 101).

Therefore we can rightly suppose, as matter previous to our treatise, that in the preceding treatise *On Christ the Divine Legate* the truth has been demonstrated apologetically concerning the testimony which Jesus gave about his own natural divine sonship.

Moreover, we find an apologetic demonstration of Christ's divinity among many excellent recent authors in the field of sacred theology whose example we are happy to follow.¹⁶

Division of the treatise

34. From the treatise *On the Divine Legate* it is certain that Christ was endowed with a threefold messianic office, namely, *of King, of Teacher, of Priest*; hence he rightly defined himself when he said: *I am the way, the truth and the life* (John 14:6).¹⁷

From the sources of our treatise, as we shall see, the conclusion is drawn imme-

16. H. Dieckmann, *De revelatione christiana* ass.12 n.668; H. van Laak, *Institut. Theologiae fundamentalis* tr.3 n.68-165; Id., *Repetitorium de Revelatione* prop.4 p.105; G. Wilmers, *De Religione revelata* prop.40 n.397; R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *De Revelatione* l.2 c.2 a.3; H. Felder, *Apologetica* pars.I s.2; I. Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* I § 43 p.707; A.C. Cotter, *Theologia fundamentalis* th.15 ad 23; P. Parente, *Theologia fundamentalis Apologetica* c.3 § 2; C. Baisi, *De Revelatione christiani* c.6 th.10; in this vol. *De Rev. Christi* th.30.

17. You can find the *Catholic doctrine* about this threefold office of Christ beautifully and briefly explained in the *Roman Catechism* (= RC). Ed. Desclée: *Catechismus Tridentini ad Parochos* (1890) p.1, Symboli a.2 n.6-8. St. Leo I said: Christ is for us "the Way of holy living, the Truth of divine teaching, and the Life of eternal beatitude" (*Serm.* 72,1: ML 54,390; see *The Imitation of Christ*, book 3, chapter 56); I. Gomá, *Jesucristo Redentor*, c.5-7; Rey-Sacerdote-Maestro, p.133-240; M. Meinertz, *Theologie des N.T.* (1950) I p.79.172-175.

diately in the Church that “from the command of the divine Redeemer there are the perennial *offices of Christ of King, Teacher and Priest*”; and therefore the Lord himself “conferred on the Church this threefold power, namely, *of ruling, of teaching and of sanctifying*,” and that “he established it as the primary law of the whole Church.”¹⁸

Therefore we have decided to divide the treatise on the Church *into three books*, which correspond to the three mentioned offices of Christ and the Church:

Book I: *Christ the King established the Church endowed with the power of ruling.*

Book II: *Christ the Teacher conferred on the Church the duty of teaching.*

Book III: *Christ the Priest enriched the Church with the power of sanctifying.*

18. Pius XII, Encyclical “*Mystici Corporis*”: AAS 35 (1943) 200,209. Recently again and clearly Pius XII distinguished the threefold power of the Church, when in his *Allocution “Si diligis”* to the Cardinals and Bishops of the whole world he spoke about the power of the Magisterium, and at the same time promised that he would treat, which he actually did do, the other two powers in a future *Allocution* to the Pastors of all the churches, “*Magnificate Dominum*,” on May 31 and November 2 in 1954: AAS 46 (1954) 314ff.666ff.

B O O K I

ON THE SOCIAL CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH

C H A P T E R I

On the institution of the hierarchical Church

A R T I C L E I

CHRIST THE KING PREACHED THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Thesis 1. Jesus Christ preached a universal Kingdom, not only eschatological, spiritual and internal, but also existing on earth, visible and external.

35. S.Th. I-II, q. 108, a. 1f.; *In Io.* 18,33-37; Suarez, *In 3* q.22 d.47f.; Dieckmann, *De eccles.* Th.4-8; D'Herbigny, *De Eccles.* Th.4, see n.249-251; Lercher, th.26; Zappelena, th.1 ad 3; Schultes, *De Eccles.* a.6; Cotter, *Theol. fund.* th.25; I. de la Briere: DAFC 1,1222ff.; J.A. Oñate, *El Reino de Dios: EstBibl* 3 (1944) 343-382, 496-522; 4 (1945) 15-34, 163-196, 421-446; 5 (1946) 101-110; L. Cerfaux, *L'Eglise et le Règne de Dieu d'après saint Paul: Recueil* L. Cerfaux (1954) II p.365-387.

36. Connection. In the preceding treatise it was shown that *Jesus of Nazareth*, about whom the gospels speak, was sent by God as the *Messiah* or *Christ*, whom the prophets foretold, and that the same Jesus bore witness to the fact that he is the *true Son of God*. We also presuppose as proved in the preceding treatise that Jesus Christ was announced, sent, born, proclaimed and recognized as a true *King*. Rightly therefore we now begin our new treatise with an investigation of his *Kingdom*, because that was the first thing, right from the beginning of his preaching, that Jesus proposed to men: *Jesus began to preach saying: Repent, for the Kingdom of heaven is at hand* (Matt. 4:17).

37. Definition of terms. *King* and *Kingdom* are understood in the sense of Scripture.¹ A king is that physical person who rules a public society of men, not as a representative of the people, but on his own right.

A *kingdom* is a society of citizens ruled by a king.

Kingdom of God occurs 50 times in the three synoptic gospels (14 in

1. See F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti Lexicon graecum* (βασιλεία, βασιλεύς); Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.23-29; D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.43. ThWbNT I p.562-595.

Mark, 32 in Luke, 4 in Matt.): it is the kingdom founded by God by his positive will.

Kingdom of heaven occurs 32 times and indeed only in Matt., to designate the supra-terrestrial kingdom which God decreed to establish through Christ.

Kingdom of God and *Kingdom of heaven* are two names used to signify the same thing, as is gathered clearly from the parallel places (Matt. 5:3 and Luke 6:20; Matt. 13:11 and Mark 4:11 and Luke 8:10, etc.). But St. Matthew prefers the expression "kingdom of heaven," perhaps so that he may adapt himself better to the way of speaking of the Jews, for whom especially his Gospel was intended; for, the Jews were accustomed to avoid the use of the ineffable name of God and they substituted for it the word "heaven," a metonym very familiar to them.²

38. A *universal* kingdom is destined for all men, that is, it is one to which all have the same right and duty to belong to. Therefore, the universality of *the right* and obligation is absolute. We are talking about this point, for we will deal with the universality of *the fact* when we treat catholicity.

The last kingdom is *eschatological* (ἐσχάτα = last).

The last economy of the Kingdom of God in this life is *relatively* eschatological, after the patriarchal and Mosaic, namely the messianic kingdom, because, by the will of God, no other economy of salvation on this earth will succeed it.

The absolutely eschatological Kingdom is the definitive state of the Kingdom of God, begun with faith in this world and destined to continue forever.

Spiritual and internal is that Kingdom whose end, goods and functions are above all spiritual and internal.

Existing on earth is a Kingdom that develops durably in the conditions of this earthly life of men.

Visible and external is a Kingdom implying an organization or society perceptible by the senses and made present by the external acts of men, whose nature cannot yet in this thesis be defined by us.

39. State of the question. We are saying that Christ, adorned with the title of King, preached a universal Kingdom, with an absolute universality of right and obligation, and absolutely eschatological, which especially and primarily is spiritual and internal; however, the Kingdom preached by

2. H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.23ff.; D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.43; Simón-Dorado, *Nov. Testamentum* I n.268; P. Joüon, *L'Évangile*, in Matt. 3:2.

Christ is not merely and exclusively eschatological, spiritual and internal; but it also exists on earth—visible and external. We will prove in the thesis on the perpetuity of the Church, thesis 7, that this Kingdom of Christ is also relatively eschatological.

40. Adversaries.³ 1) *Against universalism:* Rationalist critics, relying on the words of Christ: *I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel* (Matt. 15:24), hold that universalism was an invention of the martyr Stephen, the Hellenists and St. Paul, against the mind of Christ and the teaching of the other Apostles, which the primitive Church of Jerusalem faithfully retained (Acts 6:8ff.; 11:19ff.; Gal. 1—2). Harnack admitted the objective or virtual universalism of the teaching of Christ, inasmuch as the principal idea of his Gospel, of worshipping God as Father, by its very nature is apt to evolve into a universal organization; but he denies that Christ thought about universalism by calling into doubt the historical genuineness of the sayings of the Lord that have a universal significance. Others, like Holtzmann, say that Jesus gradually came to assert some sense of universalism only in the second period of his life. However, later Meyer and Weinl followed the same theological theories respectively of Harnack and Holtzmann.⁴

41.2) Eschatologists defend absolute Eschatologism, like Baldensperger, I. Weiss, Gloege and A. Schweitzer; afterwards their doctrine was followed in its substantial by the *Modernists*, like Loisy, Tyrrell, Schnitzer, and in our time also by Heiler, Bultmann, Goguel, along with some others.⁵ The Eschatologists emphasize the words of Christ by which he announced: *I say to you, there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom*, and also these words: *Hereafter you will see the Son of man seated at the right hand of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven* (Matt. 16:28; 26:64). From these and other similar words (Matt. 10:23; 24:34) they deduced that Jesus had committed an error

3. M. Meinertz, *Jesus und die Heidenmission* (1908): he gathers together various opinions and evaluates their authors. See Zapelena, D'Herbigny, Dieckmann, in the places cited in the bibliography.

4. A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (1924); E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (1924); H.J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch des neutestam. Theologie* (1897); H. Weinl, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (1928).

5. W. Baldensperger, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*³ (1903); I. Weiss, *Die Predigt Jesu von Reiche Gottes* (1900); A. Schweitzer, *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (1913); A. Loisy, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* (1902); *Au tour d'un petit livre* (1903); Schnitzer, I. *Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet?* 2. *Das Papsttum eine Stiftung Jesus?* (1910). See F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 108-136; G. Tyrrell, *Christianity at the Cross-roads* (1910); G. Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche im Neuen Testament* (1929); F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 34-47; R. Bultmann, *Theologie des N.T.* (1948) § 1-6; M. Goguel, *Les premiers temps de l'Eglise* (1949) p.142.

about the proximate institution of the messianic Kingdom, which was then thought to coincide with the end of the world; hence they conclude that it was foreign to the mind of Christ to establish a Kingdom on earth under the conditions of this time (D 3452).

42. 3) That the *Kingdom* preached by Christ is *merely spiritual and internal* is defended by many *Rationalists*, saying that Jesus had a very developed religious sense, by which he felt a much more perfect internal filial relation to God as his Father than others did, and therefore he said: *No one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son* (Matt. 11:27). But he exhorted his hearers by saying: *the Kingdom of God is in the midst of you* (Luke 17:21); therefore moved by the example and action of Christ, they felt deeply a similar internal idea of sonship towards God the Father.

43. Therefore the Kingdom founded by Jesus is constituted by those in whom there is this merely spiritual and internal awareness of a religious sense of divine sonship. But the temporal and external society was born later, having been invented by primitive Christianity, because the followers of Christ, having first of all separated themselves from the Synagogue by the action of St. Paul, and then adopting ideas from the manifold influence of Alexandrian Judaism and Hellenism, and emulating the organization of the Roman Empire, formed for themselves a visible and external society. The main defenders of this theory were Sabatier and Harnack, and recently also Barth who holds that the Kingdom of God, which appears in Christ, is not a community or gathering of believers in Christ; but it is a congregation of two or three in the name of Christ (Matt. 18:20), which is constituted by that mere *event*, whereby it happens that the vital action of the living Lord is perceived internally by the consciousness of some men, who by that very fact become the Kingdom of God or the Church, which therefore is nothing other than "the living congregation of Jesus Christ, the living Lord."⁶

44. **Doctrine of the Church.** The thesis as to all its parts can be said to be a doctrine that is *divine and Catholic faith*, because it is contained formally in Scripture and is proposed by the ordinary and universal Magisterium of

6. A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte I* (1909); *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1920); *Entstehung der christl. Theologie u. Des kirchl. Dogmas* (1927); A. Sabatier, *Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion* (1897); *Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit* (1904); K. Barth, *Die Theologie und die Kirche* (1928); Id., *L'Eglise, congrégation vivante de Jésus-christ, le Seigneur vivant: Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu I* (1949) 95-107. In this Barth is close to Tertullian when he was a Montanist: *De exhort. Cast. 7; De pudic. 21*; ML 2,922.1026.

the Church as necessary to be believed (D 3011).

Pius X condemned the error of the Eschatologists in the decree "*Lamentabili*" (D 3433, 3452).

Pius X *rejected the teachings of a merely spiritual and merely internal Kingdom* in his Encyclical "*Pascendi*" (D 3492).

Pius XI in his Encyclical "*Quas primas*," all of which deals with Christ the King and his Kingdom, openly teaches the universality of the Kingdom of Christ, and he says that its nature is indeed spiritual, but at the same time is endowed with the a threefold power, namely, legislative, judicial and executive, and that it is to be exercised on behalf of the men living in this life (D 3676-3679). Moreover, the Council of Trent had already vindicated for Christ the office of lawgiver (D 1571).

45. Theological note. Therefore the thesis is *divine and Catholic faith*, because of the reason given above in n.44.

46. Proof of the first part: Jesus preached the Kingdom.

Often and especially at the very beginning of his preaching: *From that time Jesus began to preach, saying, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand... And he went about all Galilee, teaching the gospel of the kingdom* (Matt. 4:17.23; see 5:3.10; 6:10). But when he proposes the gospel of the kingdom in parables, often he begins with these words: *The Kingdom of heaven is like...* (Matt. 13:24.31.33.44.45.47; 18:23; 20:1; 22:2; 25:1; see Matt. 13:19.38.41.43; 24:14). Rightly therefore St. Thomas says: "Since Christ said at the very outset of the preaching of the Gospel: *The kingdom of heaven is at hand* (Matt. 4:17), it is most absurd to say that the Gospel of Christ is not the Gospel of the kingdom."⁷

47. Proof of the second part: Jesus preached a universal Kingdom.

N.B. Since the Rationalists say that universalism was introduced by St. Paul, therefore it is necessary to prove this assertion independently of this Apostle. The purpose of the argument, which follows, is to show, against the Rationalists, that the idea of universalism is not foreign to the mind of Christ.

a) Jesus preached the Kingdom of God, which was announced in the O.T. But the Kingdom of God announced in the O.T. is universal. Therefore Jesus preached a universal Kingdom.

The major is clear from the preceding treatise, thesis 27, in which it was proved that Jesus is the Messiah foretold by the prophets. See Matt. 11:13; Luke 16:16; *On Christian Revelation*, thesis 27, scholium.

7. I-II, q. 106, a. 4 ad 4.

48. *The minor* is proved: Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4; 28:14; see Gal. 3:16. God says to Abraham: *By you all the families of the earth shall bless themselves (or) all the nations (or) all the nations of the earth.* Ps. 2:8: *I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession.* Ps. 47:2.3.8.9: *Clap your hands, all peoples! For the Lord the Most High is a great king over all the earth... God reigns over the nations.*

In particular, Ps. 72, recognized as messianic both by the Jews and by the Fathers and Christian exegetes, expresses the universality of the Messiah's Kingdom: "1. *Give the king thy justice, O God...* 2. *May he judge thy people with righteousness, and thy poor with justice...* 8. *May he have dominion from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth...* 11. *May all kings fall down before him, all nations serve him...* 18. *May all nations call him blessed (as in the citations from Gen.)...* 19. *And may his glory fill the whole earth.*"

What the other prophets say about the Kingdom of the Messiah agrees with these quotes, like Isa. 2:2-4; see Mic. 4:1-3: *and peoples shall flow to it... He shall judge between many peoples, and shall decide for strong nations afar off.*⁸ Dan. 2:35.44: *the stone... filled the whole earth... the kingdom of God shall break in pieces all these kingdoms... and it shall stand for ever.* Dan. 7:13-14.27: *Behold with the clouds of heaven there came one like a son of man... and to him was given a kingdom that all peoples... should serve him (see Matt. 26:64).* Mal. 1:11: *For from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure offering.* Therefore rightly Simeon called Jesus: *a light for revelation to the Gentiles (Luke 2:32).*

From this argument it is obvious that the idea of universalism is clearly affirmed in the sacred books of the O.T., starting from Genesis up to the last prophet; hence for certain, against the Rationalists, it is necessary to hold that the idea of universalism could not be foreign to the mind of Christ and his Jewish audience. Indeed also this idea of universalism is at the basis of the proselytism which the Jews practiced at the time of Christ and concerning which Jesus said: *Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you traverse sea and land to make a single proselyte (Matt. 23:15).*

49. b) The Kingdom preached by Jesus will be universal in its consummation. Therefore consequently it will also be in its preparation on earth.

The antecedent is proved from the final judgment: Matt. 25:31-46. For, the Kingdom of Christ at the consummation will be initiated by a universal

8. See Leo XIII, "*Satis cognitum*," where the universal meaning of these texts is affirmed (ASS 28,713). For an explanation of the Psalms, see L. Pirot, *La sainte Bible* 5 (1937).

judgment, in which the sentence will be given by Christ the King according to the law of Christ, and because of the service rendered to Christ.

Therefore, the obligation to observe the law of Christ on earth must also be universal, according to the level of its promulgation, both before and after the coming of Christ.

50. c) From explicit testimonies:

1) Because Christ entrusts to his Apostles the universal preaching of his gospel on the mount in Galilee: *Go therefore and make disciples of all nations. Go into all the world and preach the gospel to the whole creation:* Matt. 28:18; Mark 16:15. He says the same thing before his Ascension, Luke 24:47: *Repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem.*

2) Because Christ foretold the universality of the preaching: Matt. 5:13: The Apostles are *the light of the world*; Matt. 8:11: *many will come from East and West*; Matt. 24:14: *And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world*; Matt. 26:13: the gospel is preached everywhere in the whole world; Acts 1:8: *you shall be my witnesses to the end of the earth.*

51. 3) Because Christ defined the universal quality of the Kingdom of God when he was explaining its nature by parables: *the mustard seed*, Matt. 13:31: *a tree larger than all others of its kind*; *the weeds*, Matt. 13:36: the field, in which it is sown, *is the world, the harvest is the close of the age*; *the net*, Matt. 13:47: *gathered fish of every kind*, good and bad to be separated at the end of the world; *the vineyard*, Matt. 21:43: *the vineyard will be given to a nation producing the fruits of it*; *the wedding*, Matt. 22:8: *invite to the wedding feast as many as you find...* and they gathered all whom they found.

52. Proof of the third part: Jesus preached an eschatological Kingdom, but one also existing on earth.

A) *An Eschatological Kingdom:* a) Because it is announced in the Sermon on the mount, Matt. 5:12, *your reward in heaven*;

b) Because it is stated in the parables of the Weeks and the Net, Matt. 13:39-49, that the harvest and the gathering in will take place *at the consummation of the world*;

c) Because the triumph and retribution of the King of the Kingdom of God will take place at the final judgment, Matt. 25:31-34, when the Son of

man comes on the clouds at the end of the world, Matt. 24:29-31.⁹ On the eschatological character of the Kingdom preached by Christ there can be no doubt. Indeed it must be conceded that all the preaching of the Kingdom of God has this purpose—that men be disposed to obtain, as their reward, the eschatological Kingdom of Christ.

53. B) *The Kingdom of God existing on earth:* a) From the explicit testimonies:

1) Because Christ says that the Kingdom of God is already present among those to whom he is speaking: Matt. 12:21-28; Luke 17:20-21: *the kingdom of God has come upon you. The kingdom of God is in the midst of you.*

2) Because Christ speaks about it as something present: *From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven has suffered violence and men of violence take it by force* (βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἄρπάζουσιν αὐτήν): Matt. 11:12-24.

a) βιάζεται, if it is *in the middle voice* (Luke 16:16), then the meaning is: the Kingdom of Christ manifests its *power* by which it strongly opens the way for itself, and the *violent* are said to be the men who manifest their power in order to take possession of it (Simón-Dorado).

β) βιάζεται, if it is *in the passive voice*, then it can be given two meanings:

γ) *In a friendly sense* it means: the Kingdom of Christ is desired avidly and with great effort, and the *violent* are those passionate men who try to obtain it as it were by force.

δ) *In a hostile sense* it means: the Kingdom of Christ is attacked by the power of persecutions, and the *violent* are those persecutors who strive to plunder and destroy the Kingdom: this meaning is more in accordance with the text, with the context and with similar places: Matt. 21:32; 23:13 (Knabenbauer).¹⁰

ε) The *ascetical* interpretation is not very literal: the Kingdom of Christ is to be obtained with great effort and only those who do violence to themselves will enter into it: It is similar to the interpretations α and γ.

In all the interpretations the Kingdom of Christ is shown as already existing on earth.

3) The parable of the Sower expressly describes the Kingdom as existing in this world: *As for what was sown among thorns, this is he who hears the word, but the cares of the world and the delight in riches choke the word*

9. The title "Son of man" announced by Daniel (7:13) is used by Jesus 80 times in the gospels to designate himself; see R. Graber, *Petrus der Fels* (1949) 34; *De revel. christ.* n.394-398.

10. Simón-Dorado, *Novum Testamentum* I n.394; Knabenbauer, *Comment. in Evang. S.Matth.* in Matt. 11:12; F.C. Ceulemans, *Comment. in Evang. sec. Matth.* in Matt. 11:12-14; G. Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 1,608-613.

and it proves unfruitful (Matt. 13:4-9.18-23).

54. b) *Straightforwardly* from the parables of the *Weeds* and the *Net* (Matt. 13:36-43.47-50). For, in these parables the twofold stage of the Kingdom of God is accurately distinguished—the temporal stage of vicissitudes which can be had only in the conditions of earthly life, and the eschatological stage after the final judgment. Therefore, a *merely* eschatological interpretation is absolutely excluded.

c) *Clearly* from the sermon of the Lord which is called *eschatological* (Matt. 24:4-36), in which the Lord corrects the eschatological error into which some of his disciples seem to have fallen (Matt. 24:3; Acts 1:6), thinking that the destruction of the City, the end of the world and the final coming of the Son of man would all soon take place at the same time. Christ warns his disciples that they should take care not to be deceived by such an error, but many things will take place and will have to be endured before the Kingdom of God is preached in the whole world. Hence the interpretation about an imminent eschatological Kingdom is to be completely rejected.¹¹

d) *Implicitly*, finally, the long instructions of the Lord about the pastoral ministry and about the many labors to be endured in exercising it after the Ascension of the Lord exclude any mere eschatologism (Matt. 10:16-42; 18:1-35; John 13—17; see n.104).

55. Proof of the fourth part: Jesus surely preached a Kingdom that is primarily spiritual and internal, but it is also external and visible.

1) *The Kingdom of Christ is spiritual and internal:*

A) *From its primary purpose* which is to obtain the salvation of the soul through moral perfection; this consists, *negatively*, in the abnegation of one's own person and of temporal things, but *positively* in the perfect love of God and of others. But such a purpose is spiritual and internal. Therefore the Kingdom also is primarily spiritual and internal.

56. The minor is evident by its own terms.

The major is proved: a) The purpose is the salvation of the soul: Luke 19:10 to Zachaeus: *For the Son of man came to seek and to save the lost*. The parables about the lost sheep, about finding the drachma and about the prodigal son prove the same thing: Luke 15:1-32, in which what is stated especially is the intention of the Kingdom of Christ to save the souls of

11. M. Brunec, *Sermo eschatologicus*: VerDom 30 (1952) 214-218, 265-277, 321-331; 31 (1953) 13-20, 83-94, 156-163, 211-220, 282-290, 344-351.

men. That the purpose of the work of Christ is the salvation of men is clear *from the very name of Jesus* which was given to him by God (Matt. 1:21).

b) Through moral perfection: Matt. 5:48 *You, therefore, must be perfect*, which is like the conclusion of the promulgated perfection of the New Law, whereby the imperfections of the Old Law are corrected (Matt. 5:1-47).

57. c) *Negatively*, through the abnegation of one's own person: Matt. 16:24 *If any man would come after me, let him deny himself...*; by the renunciation of temporal things: Luke 14:33 *Whoever of you does not renounce all that he has cannot be my disciple*.

d) *Positively*, through perfect love of God: Matt. 10:22 *You will be hated by all for my name's sake*; Matt. 10:37-39 *He who love father or mother more than me is not worthy of me*. Through perfect love of others: Matt. 5:43-45 *Love your enemies*; Matt. 25:31-40, 46, by the decision of the final judge according to which eternal salvation is given because of the works of fraternal charity.

58. B) *From the duties which it enjoins* which are:

Matt. 4:17, *repentance*; Mark 16:16, *faith*; John 13:34-35; 14:21-24; 15:9-14, 17, *charity*; Matt. 5:3-12, *spiritual poverty, purity of heart, meekness, patience, justice, mercy, love of peace and suffering persecutions*. All of these duties are primarily spiritual and internal.

Matt. 5:17, 21, 27, 33, 38, 43 prove the same thing; they are duties characteristic of the New Law in those things in which the Old Law is corrected and completed, so that in opposition to external observance the complete subjection of the internal man is mandated; but especially Matt. 5:44; 6:12; 22:34-40, the specific command of the New Law, or the command of love, which is above all spiritual and internal: *But I say to you: Love your enemies. Forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. The great commandment: You shall love the Lord your God... you shall love your neighbor. This is my commandment that you love one another, even as I have loved you* (John 13:34; 15:12-17).

Thus if the duties that he enjoins are primarily internal and spiritual, therefore also his Kingdom which imposes them must be said to be primarily spiritual and internal.

59. C) *From the goods which it brings and they are:*

1) *Negatively*, the remission of sins: Matt. 9:1-6, 13: *I came to call sinners, your sins are forgiven*; John 20:22-23: *whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them*. The parables about the lost sheep, the drachma and

the prodigal son prove the same point; Luke 15:1-23.

60. 2) Positively: a) the celestial life by which men enlightened by a new light truly become children of God : John 1:4-9.12f.: *in him was life, and the life was the light of men, he gave power to men to become to become children of God, to those who were born of God.*

b) the grace of the Spirit, whereby men are made a temple in which God dwells: John 14:23: *the Spirit of truth dwells with you and will be in you. If a man loves me... my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him;*

c) participation in the life of Christ: John 15:4f.: *I am the vine, you are the branches: he who abides in me, and I in him, he it is that bears much fruit, for apart from me you can do nothing;*

d) intimate union with God: John 17:21: *that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us.*

61. 2) The Kingdom of Christ is also visible and external:

a) Because Christ preached the very Kingdom which had been foretold by the prophets. But the prophets foretold a messianic Kingdom visible and external. Therefore the Kingdom of Christ is also visible and external.

The major is evident from the previous treatise, in which it was proved, in thesis 27, that Jesus is the Messiah whom the prophets had foretold.

The minor can be proved from Ps. 47:2f.8f.; from Isa. 2:2-4; from Mic. 4:1-3; from Dan. 2:44; 7:13-14; from Mal. 1:11; from these texts we also proved that the universality of the messianic Kingdom was predicted in the O.T. But the same places also prove that the visible and external Kingdom of Christ was foretold, because it is also described as such (n.48).

62. b) Because Christ preached the Kingdom, which must open for him a way among obstacles, or which enemies attack and try to overcome by force, Matt. 11:12; it is like a field, in which good and bad plants, like wheat and weeds, at the same time grow visibly, Matt. 13:24-30.36-43; it is said to be like a banquet, in which they are gathered together visibly dressed in a wedding garment with others who are not so dressed, Matt. 22:1-14.

But these things cannot be verified in the Kingdom of Christ except inasmuch as it is visible and external; for, if it were invisible and merely internal, it would consist only of those who are good, with all the evil being excluded, or only of those who have the same sense of sonship, and it could not be attacked by an external enemy. Therefore Christ preached a Kingdom that is also visible and external.

63. c) Because the Kingdom preached by Christ involves visible and external duties and offices. Therefore it will be necessarily visible and external.

The antecedent is proved, because it implies a mission to be exercised in such a way that because of it its ministers suffer persecution like sheep from wolves: Matt. 10:16-18; because his doctrine is to be preached *upon the housetops*, there is the added obligation of listening to it: Matt. 10:27.40; because it implies profession to be given before men, Matt. 10:32; because it demands both instruction to be given by the Apostles or their successors, and receiving the external rite of baptism, so that a man may be incorporated into this Kingdom: Matt. 28:19; John 3:3.

d) Because according to Matt. 16:18f., the Kingdom preached by Christ is that Church, about which in the course of our whole treatise we will demonstrate that it is the true society of men living in this world; it is visible and external, hierarchical and monarchical, endowed with the social offices of teaching, sanctifying and ruling and it is recognizable because of its real visible notes.

64. Objections.¹² 1. *Against the universalism of the Kingdom of God preached by Christ.*

1. Matt. 15:24: *I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.* The mission of Christ was restricted to the house of Israel. But the mission of the Apostles is only a continuation of the mission of Christ. Therefore it was also restricted to Israel.

I distinguish the major. The mission of Christ was restricted to the house of Israel, which was to be exercised by him personally during his mortal life, *I bypass the major*; as salvific and to be continued by the Apostles, *denied*.

65. 2. Matt. 10:5: *Go nowhere among the Gentiles... but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.* Therefore the mission of the Apostles was also restricted to Israel.

I distinguish the assertion. The previous mission of the Apostles, *conceded*; their definitive mission, *denied*. In Matt. 10:1-15 he is speaking about the previous mission of the Apostles; but from verses 16 to 42 his instruction to the Apostles is about their definitive mission.

66. 3. Acts 10:1-11.18: From the way of acting of St. Peter with the *Gentile Cornelius*: the Gentile Cornelius, moved by a vision to do it, summons Peter; 10:9-23: Peter, having been instructed by God, goes to Cornelius; 10:24-33: Peter would not have gone unless he was told to do so by God; 10:34-48: Peter now for the first time (it seems) understood universalism; 11:1-8: Peter while giving an account of himself, appeals not to the command of Christ, but to the revelations given to him by God on the occasion of Cornelius.

12. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* (1950) I p.11-19, 38-41, 61-66.

From all of this arises an objection: Peter, about ten years after Christ's Ascension, did not know that the Gospel and Baptism were meant also for the Gentiles. Therefore it is necessary to conclude that Christ did not preach a universal Kingdom.

67. I admit the text and explain. Peter surely knew the universal destination of the Kingdom of God, which Christ had preached often (Matt. 28:19; Luke 24:47; Acts 2:39). He also knew that the Gospel was to be preached *first* to the Jews and *then* to the Gentiles (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8; 2:39; 13:42-48). But Peter needed to be enlightened by God in order to understand more fully that not only in the circumcised nation, but *in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him* (Acts 10:35); and he also needed to understand that *no one can forbid those to be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit*, even if they were not circumcised (Acts 10:47). A similar enlightenment was given to St. Paul himself (Acts 22:17-21). But this divine enlightenment was necessary also so that the other Christians, being converts from Judaism, would fully understand what they could justly conclude from this: *Then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life* even without circumcision (Acts 11:18). Therefore Peter and the Apostles did not yet know "the precise *time* and *way* in which the Gentiles were to be accepted into the Church: that is, they did not know whether the Gentiles must be circumcised first, or whether they could enter the Church immediately without circumcision" (F.C. Ceulemans, *In Act 10*).

Hence in form, *I distinguish the antecedent*. Peter then did not know *in a certain respect* that the Gospel and Baptism were meant also for the Gentiles, *conceded*; he did not know *simply, denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Hence it must be concluded that Christ did not preach a universal Kingdom *in a certain respect, conceded*; he did not preach it *simply, denied*.

Therefore we concede that the Apostles then did not know *in a certain respect*, that is, according to *the precise time* and *the concrete way* according to which the Gentiles then and without previous circumcision were to be accepted into the Church; but the Apostles surely knew *simply* that the Gentiles at some time and in some way, at least after receiving circumcision, were to be accepted into the Church. But since we know that the Holy Spirit was given to the Apostles, so that "he would teach them all things and bring to their remembrance everything that Christ had told them" (John 14:26), we can concede that Peter through these facts was fully instructed by the Holy Spirit concerning Cornelius with regard to the circumstances of time and manner according to which the Gentiles without any previous obligations of the Mosaic Law were to be admitted into the Kingdom of God. And it is not necessary to presuppose that the Apostles, as immediate witnesses of Christ, right from the beginning understood everything fully and perfectly (John 20:9); for, revelation was closed with the last Apostle, that is, with the death of St. John, as we will prove below in thesis 18.¹³

13. See Y. Congar, *Esquisses du Mystère de l'Eglise*, p.117-121.

68. 4. According to Acts 8:1-4; 11:19-20: the Hellenists of the group around Stephen, not the Apostles, suffered persecution from the Jews, and therefore when they were dispersed, they first began to preach to the Gentiles. Therefore the universalism was introduced not by the Apostles, but by the Hellenists.

I distinguish the antecedent. They began first to preach after Peter and with the consent of the Apostles, *I bypass the antecedent*; against the mind of the Apostles, *denied*. See Acts 10:1-11.18, which was already answered in the preceding objection.

69. 5. Rom. 11:13; Gal. 2:7-9: St. Paul is acknowledged as "the Apostle of the Gentiles." Therefore this is a sign that universalism was introduced by him.

I distinguish the antecedent. St. Paul is the Apostle of the Gentiles, in a special and relative way, *conceded*; exclusively and absolutely, *denied*. Consider the context (see Acts 13:14-47; Rom. 9:3; 1 Cor. 9:19-22).

70. II. *Against those who propose a mere eschatologism.*¹⁴

Note: regarding the following objections of the eschatologists, we can deny the supposition of the adversaries, namely, that Christ erred in this matter; for, we assume as already approved that God proved the preaching of Christ with miracles, and so it is impossible that in such an important matter he should be in error (see *On Revelation* theses 31-34).

6. Matt. 10:23: *you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes.* Therefore Jesus thought that the parousia was imminent.

A threefold answer can be given to this: 1) The towns of Israel can be understood strictly, that is, the towns existing then, but the coming of Christ as not being about the final parousia, but either about the resurrection, or about the power by which the Old Law is ended in the destruction of Jerusalem, or about his victory in the flourishing Church: several authors explain it in this way (St. Bede, St. Thomas, Lagrange, Manganot).

71 2) The coming of Christ can also be understood to be about his parousia at the end of the world, and then the towns of Israel will be, either those in which the Israelites dwell until the end of the world, or those in which there is the heir of the promises made to Israel, namely, the Church of Christ: thus not a few other authors (Knabenbauer).

72. 3) In the light of Matt. 23:29-39, we can interpret the coming of Christ as his final parousia; but the towns of Israel can be understood as those which are in the land of Israel; these will not be destroyed, because since the Jews do not accept the preaching of the Apostles begun in them, there will always be place for fleeing from one to another, and finally they will be abandoned so that the Gentiles may be converted (Acts 13:46); and afterwards, before the final coming of Christ, the rest of the Jews will be converted

14. L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus-Christ* 2 (1928) 280-312; J. Knabenbauer, *Comment in Evang. secundum Matth.* (1922); M.J. Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu* (1927); F. Segarra, S.J., *Praecipuae D.N. Jesu Christi sententiae eschatologicae* (1942).

(Rom. 9:27; 11:5.25f.). St. Hilary and St. Thomas explain this text in this way, as do some other commentators on Scripture.¹⁵

73. 7. Matt. 16:28: *there are some standing here who will not taste death before they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.*

There is a threefold response to this: 1) The coming of Christ can be understood to be about his transfiguration, which is described in the verses immediately following, Matt. 17:1-8; see Mark 9:1: thus the Fathers unanimously, westerners up until St. Gregory (+ 604), Orientals until the 8th century gave this interpretation of the text.

74. 2) St. Gregory the Great and St. Bede (+ 735) understand the coming in the Kingdom as being about the wonderful spread of the Church, see Luke 9:27. These two interpretations alone occur up until the middle of the 13th century, and St. Thomas proposes them in commenting on this text nor does he cite any others.

3) St. Albert the Great understands the coming as being about the resurrection; the Carthusian takes it for the Ascension; P. Mariana interprets it as referring to the power of Christ and his judgment concerning the destruction of Jerusalem; most recent authors follow him on this point.¹⁶

75. 8. Matt. 24:34: *this generation will not pass away till all these things take place.* In the preceding verses the concern is with the destruction of the temple and the end of the world.

There is a threefold response to this: 1) Several authors understand *this generation* to be about the contemporaries of Jesus, and then the words *all these things* to refer to the destruction of the temple and the City (Dieckmann, Grandmaison, Lagrange, Simón-Dorado).

2) Others say that *this generation* is the nation of the Jews and then they think that *all these things* is to be understood to be about the destruction of the temple and the end of the world (St. Jerome, Knabenbauer, Prat, Ceulemans). Zapelena intends to perfect this explanation when he says that *this generation* signifies "especially the Jewish generation, but not exclusively, but as firmly and morally one whether with the fathers in the order of guilt or with descendants in the order of punishment." But *all these things* "signifies the total punishment corresponding to the national guilt of a perverse generation" (see Matt. 23:29-39).

76. 3) Still others say: *this generation* signifies literally the contemporaries of Christ, figuratively the nations of the Jews; they interpret *all these things* literally as referring to the destruction of the temple, but figuratively to the end of the world (Fillion, Tromp). St. Thomas, in his Commentary on this text, mentions the first of these solutions, but he thinks that the second one is to be preferred, but he completes it by

15. St. Hilary: ML 9,971-972; St. Thomas, *In Matt* 10:23; C. A. Lapide, *In Matt* 10:23; F. Segarra, *op.cit.*, 100-200.

16. J. de Mariana, *Scholia in Mt* 16 (1620) 755; F. Segarra, *op.cit.*, 19-99; H. Dieckmann, *De revelatione* n.127; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* I p.16-22.

saying that "this generation" is understood to be about all the faithful constituting one generation of the Church continuing until the day of judgment."¹⁷

77. 9. Matt. 26:64: *hereafter you will see the Son of man seated at the right of Power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.*

Response. That "hereafter," ἄπ' ἄρτι, is lacking in Mark 14:26; in Luke 22:69 we read simply "from now on," ἀπό τοῦ νῦν.

With these words Jesus announces to the Priests the fulfillment in him of the prophecies in Ps. 110:1 (see Matt. 22:4) about the manifestation of the power of God, and Dan. 7:13, about his coming on the clouds: first of all they could see it even then with Jesus hanging on the cross when the sun was darkened and the earth was shaken, or then in the resurrection, in Pentecost and in the Church expanded with amazing power; but the second fulfillment is in the Ascension and again it is to be seen by all at the coming of Christ for the last judgment. Therefore the words of the Lord make excellent sense, whether that "hereafter" refers to proximate time or merely to posterity.

78. 10. Christ himself said: *My kingdom is not of this world* (John 18:36). Therefore it is only eschatological.

Response. According to the context, *I distinguish the major.* Christ said that his Kingdom in its origin and nature is not a worldly and earthly one, which has as its end to procure temporal goods and has soldiers who will fight for their King, *conceded*; he said that his Kingdom does not exist in this world, even though in its origin and nature it is not of this world, but has as its end to procure without arms the eternal goods of its citizens, *denied*.

Christ concerning his Kingdom said what he proclaimed about himself and about his Apostles: *those whom you have given me are not of the world, even as I am not of the world*; and nevertheless, *these things I speak in the world and these are in the world* (John 17:11-16). In his response to Pilate Jesus gives him in advance the answer to the accusation of the Jews: *Every one who makes himself a king sets himself against Caesar* (John 19:12); for, "he who gives heavenly kingdoms does not snatch away mortal ones."

The difficulty arising from 1 Thess. 4:13-18 can be answered from 1 Thess. 5:1-3; 2 Thess. 1:7-12; see 2 Pet. 3:8-16; Matt. 24:36.42-44; D 3628-3630. There will be more about this later in n.538f.

79. III. *Against those who defend a merely internal Kingdom.*

11. Matt. 13:44f.: The Kingdom of God is compared to a hidden treasure; therefore it is invisible.

I distinguish the antecedent. It is a hidden treasure, since because of its excellence it is not easily perceived by all and it is to be preferred to all other things, *conceded*; because it is merely invisible, *denied*.

17. St. Thomas, *Comment. et Catena* at this place. L. de Grandmaison, *Jésus-Christ* 2 (1928) 457-463. See the authors whom T. Zapelena cites in *De Ecclesia* (1950) I p.23-28; F. Segarra, *op.cit.*, 285-440; J.A. Oñate, *El Reino de Dios*: EstBibl 4 (1944) 343-382, 495-522; 4 (1945) 15-34, 163-196, 421-446; 5 (1946) 101-110; Simón-Dorado, n.628-635.

80. 12. But Luke 17:21 says, the Kingdom is *among you*; therefore it is merely internal.

I distinguish the antecedent. He says that the Kingdom is already present among those to whom Jesus is speaking *conceded*; he says it is in the hearts of the individual Pharisees, *denied*.

See the context and from it one can conclude that it is not possible to be understood that Christ said that the Kingdom of God is in the hearts of the Pharisees to whom the Lord was speaking.

81. 13. John 4:23: The Kingdom of Christ is merely spiritual, because it is composed of those who worship the Father *in spirit and in truth*.

I distinguish. These words signify that the Kingdom of Christ is primarily and principally spiritual, *conceded*; exclusively spiritual, *denied*.

82. 14. But in Rom. 14:17 the Kingdom of Christ is said to be *righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit*. Therefore the Kingdom must be thought to be spiritual.

I distinguish. Primarily and principally, *conceded*; exclusively, *denied*.

83. 15. But according to 1 Cor. 12:6.11 in the Kingdom of Jesus the Spirit does everything.

I distinguish. As an invisible principle in the visible body of the Kingdom of God, which vivifies, *conceded*; as the only cause excluding every visible and external element of the Kingdom of God, *denied*.

84. Scholium. Christ not only preached a religious and universal Kingdom, as we have seen, but he also said that the religious economy of the O.T. was going to be abrogated, and for it he substituted a new religious order.¹⁸

We are saying 1) *that Christ meant that the O.T. was going to be abrogated*, because in the Gospels we do not find words of Christ explicitly abrogating the O.T. And although in the books of the O.T. the N.T is announced (Jer. 31:31; see Heb. 8:8; Isa. 53:3), nevertheless the post-prophetic books remain silent about this and during the time of Christ the Jews generally considered the O.T. as absolute and eternal. However, since the O.T. finally was to be abrogated by the death of Christ, it is not surprising that Christ acknowledged it in his life: a) *in his private life*—he is circumcised and presented in the temple, he celebrates the Passover (Luke 2:21.41); b) *in his public life*—he acknowledges the temple (Matt. 21:12), the Priests (Matt. 8:4), the Scribes (Matt. 23:3), the Sanhedrin (Matt. 26:63), the prerogative of the people of Israel regarding the priority of election and custody of revelation (Matt. 10:6; 15:24; Rom. 3:2; 9:4), the Law itself (Matt. 19:16), the value of the O.T. (Matt. 5:17).

18. H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* th.7 n.166-201. Pius XII: "On the Cross, then, the Old Law died—soon to be buried and to become lethal": (Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*": AAS 35 [1943] 205).

85. The meaning of the future abrogation of the O.T. is certain from the words of Christ himself. For, the essential elements of the O.T. are; Circumcision (Gen. 17:10), the Temple (Exod. 25—27), the Sabbath (Exod. 20:8; 31:12), levitical Purity (Lev. 11), Prerogatives of the people of Israel (Deut. 7), the Law itself (Exod. 19—24 and passim). But Christ equates Circumcision with healing (John 7:22), he announces that the Temple is to be destroyed and emptied (Matt. 23:38; 24:2), he terminates the Sabbath and says that he is the Lord of it and of the Temple (John 5:18; Matt. 12:6.8), he rejects levitical Purity (Matt. 15:11), he rejects the prerogative of the people of Israel (Matt. 8:10; 21:43), he completes and perfects the Law itself, and he abolishes its indults (Matt. 5:21-48).

86. We are saying 2) *that Christ has substituted his new religious order for the Old Testament*, because he explicitly says that its nature is only preparatory and declarative of the new order to be established by him (Matt. 11:10-14; Luke 24:44), and especially because Christ instituted a *New Covenant* in his own blood, in place of that which Yahweh had decreed for the people of Israel in the blood of animals through the ministry of Moses (Exod. 24:5-8).

<p>87. Exod. 24:8 [Moses] <i>took the blood and threw it upon the people and said: Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words.</i></p>	<p>Luke 22:20 [Jesus took] <i>likewise the cup after supper, saying: This cup which is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood</i> (Matt. 26:28; 1 Cor. 11:25).</p>
--	--

The similarity between the two Covenants is clear from the form; and the words themselves, which Christ used, necessarily had to remind the Apostles of the Old Covenant. But the difference is also manifest, because the New Covenant, is sealed not with the blood of animals, but with the precious blood of the Son of God. Therefore, Christ in the New Covenant completed and also perfected the pre-figuration of the Old Covenant (see D 1348).

ARTICLE II

CHRIST INSTITUTED THE COLLEGE OF THE APOSTLES

Thesis 2. Christ instituted the College of Twelve Apostles, to whom he committed his mission; and he conferred the same Apostolate on St. Paul that he did on the College.

88. S.Th. II-II, q. 33, a. 4 ad 2; *In Mt* 10:1f.; *In Io* 20-21; *Ga* 2:11; Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.1 n.1-11; Dieckmann, th. 9f. n.249ff. and 288ff.; Franzelin, th.8; D'Herbigny, th.10 n.94ff; see n.162; Lercher, n.270ff.; Dorsch, p.84ff.; Wilmers, th.20 n.62ff.; Zapelena (1950) th.7; Cotter, th.27. On the word "Apostle" in the N.T., see Campenhausen and Mosbech in *StudTheol* 1 (1948) 96-130; 2 (1950) 166-200; M. Meinertz, *Theol. des N.T.* (1950) I p.69-79.

89. We suppose as already proved, in the preceding treatise, that Christ was the divine Legate, and in the previous thesis, that he preached a Kingdom existing on earth, visible and external. Now we ask whether Christ committed his divine Legation to others to be continued and under what form he began to organize the external Kingdom which he taught. The thesis answers this question.

90. *To institute* is to do something definitely and firmly in the moral or juridical order with a will that is free, authoritative and expressed.

The disciples of Christ are those who follow the theoretical instruction and the practical way of living of the Master.

Apostle, the Greek word from ἀποστέλλω, means *sent*: therefore the Apostles are those twelve disciples chosen specially by Christ and *sent*; therefore they are called *Apostles* (Luke 6:13),¹ because they represent the person of the one sending them and they act as his plenipotentiaries (John 13:16).

A *college* is a moral body, whereby those chosen to belong to it are united together by a social bond and are distinguished from others.

The Legation of Christ is a commission and office accepted from the Father to obtain the salvation of men; by it Christ is constituted the divine Legate, and it belongs to him according to his human nature (see above, II, thesis 28).

1. The word Ἀπόστολος in the books of the N.T. occurs 79 times, of which 35 are in the letters of St. Paul, 28 in the Acts of the Apostles, 6 in the Gospel of St. Luke, and the remaining 10 in the other N.T. books. The Twelve and St. Paul are called Apostles in the strict sense; in the broader sense they are the Missionaries sent by the Twelve or by St. Paul to preach the Gospel. See F. Zorell, *N.T. Lexicon graecum*; H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.249-310; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante* (1927) 46-68; J. Bouché, *Apostolat*: DDC I, 674-692; A. Medebielle: DBS *Apostolat*, 1,533-588. On the literature of non-Catholics and theories about the word and concept of an Apostle, see O. Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche* (1932) 68-100; Rengstorf, *Theol. Wört. Z. N.T.* I 406-448.

91. *Paul* is that historical person, whom we know especially from his letters and from the Acts of the Apostles.

The *apostolate* is the same, not according to the manner, whereby he is one of the Twelve; but according to the nature of the Apostolate, whereby Paul was called immediately, chosen and sent to preach his gospel just like the other Apostles.

92. Adversaries. 1) *Rationalists*: a) *Spiritualists* are those who deny that Christ thought about establishing a permanent external group, since he advocated only an internal movement of a sense of sonship towards God (Ritschl, Schleiermacher, Harnack); hence there is no historical value in the catalogues of the twelve Apostles, since they are figurative and symbolic fictions of the Jewish-Christians (Weiss, Seufert, Schütz).

93. b) *Evolutionists* concede that Christ had a more intimate relation of necessity with those who were endowed with *charisms*, but he did not establish anything stable and *juridical* (Sohm); and although they admit the historical truth of the College of Twelve, nevertheless they say that this was done in a transitory way for the early mission just to the Jews, and Matt. mentions this in chapter 10; but they say that afterwards Paul, in order to protect his power, elevated the universal authority of the Apostles, created the College of the Twelve, to which he made himself an equal (Lightfoot, Monnier, Harnack).²

94. 2) *The Eschatologists and Modernists*, as a result of their eschatological doctrine, hold that Christ did indeed distinguish the Twelve from the other disciples, not however in order to commit to them any power or universal and stable legation, but only so that they might be like the remnant of Israel to be saved or companions of his triumph in the imminent end of the world, and to represent the twelve tribes of the true Israel in the eschatological Kingdom.³

95. 3) All *Naturalists* reject the Apostolate of St. Paul, since it is founded

-
2. A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* (1857); F. Schleiermacher, *Reden über die Religion* (1879); J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (1917); A. Harnack, *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1920); R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht I* (1923); J.B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians* (1865) 89-97; W. Seufert, *Der Ursprung und die Bedeutung des Apostolates* (1887); H. Monnier, *La notion de l'Apostolat* (1903); R. Schütz, *Apostel und Jünger* (1921); A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (1924). See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.258-270.
3. A. Loisy, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise* (1908); O. Scheel, *Die Kirche im Christentum* (1912); H.D. Wendland, *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus* (1931); M. Goguel, *Le problème de l'Eglise dans le Christianisme primitif. Unité et diversité du Christianisme primitif*: *RevHistPhRel* 18 (1938) 293-320; 19 (1939) 1-54; Id., *L'idée d'Eglise dans le N.T.: Origènes et nature de l'Eglise* (1939) 53-108; F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 43. See F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 52-62.

on visions, for which they acknowledge only subjective value, but not all its historicity and objective truth (Weizsaecker, Zahn). The *Critics* hold that the Apostolate of St. Paul is contrary to that of St. Peter (Baur, Holl, Goguel).⁴

4) On the opposite side they also are adversaries who, like the Jansenist Barcos, so extol St. Paul that they make him a complete equal to St. Peter, even with regard to the Primacy (D 1999); and also the Orientals who want to diminish the prerogatives of the Primacy (D 3555). We will treat this matter in the thesis on the Primacy.

96. State of the question. We are considering the *Legation* or the mission which Christ, that is, the Messiah, had according to his human nature, and we say that it was given to the Twelve Apostles and to St. Paul.

97. Doctrine of the Church. The whole thesis is a matter of *divine faith*, because it is contained explicitly in Scripture.

Moreover, from the magisterium of the Church it must be said to be at least *Catholic doctrine*. For a) the doctrine about choice and mission of the Apostles is taught by Vatican I in the Constitution I on the Church (D 3050); the following was prepared to be proposed to the Vatican Council for a further explanation of the Church in Constitution II, ch.8: "To his beloved disciples, stating the name with which he called them, the divine Redeemer said: *As the Father has sent me, even so I send you*" (John 20:21). This is expressly proposed by Leo XIII in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" (see below in n.105), and by Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*."⁵

"The divine Redeemer began to build the mystical temple of his Church when he was preaching and... while he was fulfilling his function as preacher he was choosing his Apostles, sending them as he had been sent by the Father (John 17:18), that is to say, as teachers, rulers, and sanctifiers in the community of the believers... For, in virtue of the juridical mission by which the divine Redeemer sent forth his Apostles into the world as he himself had been sent by the Father (John 20:21), it is indeed he who baptizes through the Church, he who teaches, governs, absolves, binds, offers and makes sacrifice... Hence there can be no real opposition or incompatibility between the invisible mission of the Holy Spirit and the juridical office which pastors and teachers have received from Christ. Like body and soul in us, the two realities are complementary and

4. C. Weizsaecker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter* (1902) 6-12; T. Zahn, *Die Apostelgeschichte hl. Paulus* (1907); he reviews the naturalistic opinions p.38-87; F.C. Baur, *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi* (1945); V. Lüttger, *Amt und Geist im Kampf* (1911); K. Holl, *Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus* (1921); M. Goguel, *La conception jérusalémite de l'Eglise: Mélanges F. Cumont I* (1936) 209-223. W. Mundle wrote against Holl, *Das Kirchenbewusstsein der ältesten Christenheit: ZNTWiss 22* (1923) 20-42.

5. Msi 53,314; Leo XIII: ASS 28 (1896) 712-717; Pius XII: AAS 35 (1943) 204.218.224.

perfect each other, both having their origin in our one and the same Savior who not only said, as he breathed the divine Spirit upon the Apostles: *Receive the Holy Spirit*, but also enjoined aloud: *As the Father has sent me, I also send you* (John 20:21f.); and again: *He who hears you hears me* (Luke 10:16)."

98. b) Gelasius I and Innocent X (D 350-351 and 1091, see D 3555) teach the doctrine of the equality of St. Paul with St. Peter with regard to the Apostolate, but at the same time they maintain Paul's due subordination to Peter by reason of his Primacy.

Theological note. The thesis is *Catholic and divine faith*.

99. Proof of the first part: Christ instituted the College of the Twelve Apostles to which he committed his mission.

1) *Christ gathered together his disciples*, who followed not only his theoretical teaching, but also his moral and religious way of living. The disciples of Christ are mentioned 170 times in the Gospels.

Luke 6:17 speaks about *the crowd of disciples* who followed Jesus; Luke 10:1.17: *The Lord appointed seventy-two others* (from among his disciples) *and sent them on ahead of him, two by two, into every own and place*; therefore Christ used some of his disciples as his assistants.

In Matt. 8:19-20; Matt. 9:14-15 the disciples follow the way of living of the Master (see Matt. 10:24f.; Luke 6:40; John 13:16). *Teacher, I will follow you wherever you go. And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head.*

In Luke 19:37-39 they are clearly recognized as disciples of Christ, even by the Pharisees. The Pharisees said: *Teacher, rebuke your disciples....*

100. 2) *Christ out of his disciples chose Twelve; with them*, united together by a closer bond, he constituted a College, like a *Twelve Man Team*: hence the individual members are called "one of the Twelve."

a) Matt. 10:1ff. and John 6:70 suppose that the choice had already been made.

b) Mark 3:13f. and Luke 6:11ff. narrate their choice.⁶

101. c) From the narration in Luke 6:12 it is implied that this choice is very important, because before making this choice the Lord prepared himself by prayer. It is also implied that the name itself was given to them by

6. J.L. Leuba, *L'institution et l'événement* (1950) 59.

Christ: "whom he named Apostles." But Mark 3:14.16 says expressly: *And he appointed twelve, to be with him, and to be sent out to preach and have authority to cast out demons. And he appointed the twelve.*

With these words the constitution of the College as such is signified for a certain purpose, namely, *to be with him* (see Acts 5:17) *and to be sent out to preach*. Indeed, the name itself Ἀπόστολος signifies the purpose of this choice, ἀποστέλλειν. Therefore in these places, besides many others, they are named and distinguished from others by the collegial name of the "Twelve"; in fact sometimes they are named in this way even though their number has diminished because of Judas: John 20:24; 1 Cor. 15:5 (Greek) *Now Thomas, one of the twelve.*—"καὶ ὡφθη Κηφα εἶτα τοῖς δώδεκα."

d) Christ with special emphasis stresses the distinction which he bestows and which is involved in being one of the "Twelve"; because of this, he expected from them a special fidelity: Mark 14:17-20; John 6:66-70 *One of you will betray me... one of the Twelve.—Did I not choose you, the twelve, and one of you is a devil?*

102. e) All recognize the "Twelve" from the choice of Christ to constitute a closed group of those who were to be designated by the Lord with a singular prerogative in preference to all others. The catalogues of the names of the "Twelve" composed accurately and in a certain order by the Evangelists prove this:

Matt. 10:1ff.	Mark 3:16ff.	Luke 6:14ff.	Acts 1:13ff.
Simon Peter	Simon Peter	Simon Peter	Peter
Andrew	James	Andrew	John
James	John	James	James
John	Andrew	John	Andrew
Philip	Philip	Philip	Philip
Bartholomew	Bartholomew	Bartholomew	Thomas
Thomas	Matthew	Matthew	Batholomew
Matthew	Thomas	Thomas	Matthew
James, Alphaeus	James, Alphaeus	James, Alphaeus	James, Alphaeus
Thaddaeus	Thaddaeus	Simon the Zealot	Simon the Zealot
Simon, Cananaean	Simon, Cananaean	Judas son of James	Judas son of James
Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	Judas Iscariot	_____

103. It should be noted that the names of the other disciples of Christ are not mentioned, but certainly the names of the Twelve are given, without omitting the name of the traitor, except in the Acts of the Apostles. Furthermore, in all the catalogues Judas Iscariot is placed last, but Simon Peter has the first place and his is said to be first by Matthew: *first (πρῶτος) Simon, who is called Peter*: Simon the Cananaean is the same as Simon the Zealot, for the Hebrew word Kana means Zealot. Judas of James and Thaddaeus designate the same person (John 14:22; Luke 6:15; Mark 3:18; Matt. 10:3; Jude 1).⁷

104. f) Christ instructed these Twelve in a special way and so prepared them for the mission he was going to give them.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Matt. 10:1—11:1 on the nature of exercising the office of preaching;

Matt. 13:10-36 (Mark 4:10) on the parables dealing with the Kingdom of God, which he explained only to his Apostles: *privately to his own disciples he explained everything* (Mark 4:34);

Matt. 18:1-35 (Mark 9:35) on the way of ruling and correcting the faithful in the Church;

Matt. 24—25 on the destruction of the City, on the end of the world and the judgment, and about the permanence of the Kingdom of God in spite of the persecutions of enemies;

John 13:17 (Mark 13:1-3) on the mysteries of the divine life and on charity;

In particular: on the death and resurrection of Jesus: Matt. 16:21; 17:22; 20:17; 26:2; on the New Covenant established in his blood: Matt. 16:20; Mark 14:17; Luke 22:14; on the Apostolate to be exercised now: Acts 1:3; Luke 24:25.

Therefore, Christ really established the College of the “Twelve,” whom he instructed in a special way for the mission he was giving them.

N.B. against the eschatologists that Christ would not have given them so many and such detailed instructions if he thought the world was about to end soon.

105. 3) Christ committed his Mission to the Apostles.

a) Christ himself says that he is giving the Apostles the same Mission which he had received from the Father: *I have manifested thy name to the men whom thou gavest to me out of the world... Now they know that everything that thou hast given me is from thee; for I have given them the words which thou gavest me, and they have received them and know in truth that I came from thee; and they have believed that thou didst send*

7. See J. Knabenbauer, *Comment. in Evang.* (1922-1925); L. Pirot, *Le Sainte Bible. Evangiles et Epître de St. Jude* (1934-1938); Simón-Dorado, *Praelect. N.T.* I n.355.

me... I have given them thy word; and the world has hated them because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world... Sanctify them in the truth; thy word is truth. As thou didst send me into the world, so I have sent them into the world (John 17:6ff.14.17f.; see John 10:36).⁸

Leo XIII accurately explains this identity of Mission in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*," when he says: "For what did Christ, the Lord, ask? What did he wish in regard to the Church founded, or about to be founded? This: to transmit to it the same mission and the same mandate which he had received from the Father, that they should be perpetuated. This he clearly resolved to do: this he actually did. *As the Father has sent me, I also send you* (John 20:21). *As thou hast sent me into the world I also have sent them into the world* (John 17:18)... When about to ascend into heaven he sends his Apostles in virtue of the same power by which he had been sent from the Father; and he charges them to spread abroad and propagate his teaching: *All power is given to me in heaven and on earth. Going therefore teach all nations... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you* (Matt. 28:18ff.). So that those obeying the Apostles might be saved, and those disobeying should perish: *He that believes and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believes not shall be condemned* (Mark 16:16)...Hence he commands that the teaching of the Apostles should be religiously accepted and piously kept as if it were His own: *He who hears you hears me, and he who despises you despises me* (Luke 10:16). Wherefore the Apostles are ambassadors of Christ as he is the ambassador of the Father: *As the Father sent me so also I send you* (John 20:21)" (ASS 28,712-717).

b) The object of the Mission is the same: of the Precursor (Matt. 3:2), of Christ (Matt. 4:17), of the Apostles (Matt. 10:5-7). *Going... preach and say: the Kingdom of heaven is at hand.*

c) The person sent is morally the same as the person sending, Matt. 10:40; Luke 10:16: *He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me.* See John 13:20.

d) The fullness of power and the universality are also the same, Matt. 28:18-20: *All authority has been given to me... go therefore and make disciples of all nations... and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age.*

106. Proof of the second part: Christ conferred on St. Paul the same Apostolate as he did on the College of the Twelve (II-II, q. 33, a. 4 ad 2).

I say the same, not regarding the manner, by which he would be one of the Twelve, but regarding the substance or nature of the Apostolate, because Paul, like each one of the Twelve, was called immediately by Christ, chosen and sent to preach the same Gospel.

8. See Knabenbauer and Ceulemans, *Commentarii in John* 17:17-19.

107. Proof. A) In general. 1) regarding its divine origin Acts. 9:15; Gal. 1:1.11f.15: *He is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles. Paul an Apostle—not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ;*

2) regarding the object, which is to teach, to sanctify, to rule, to bring to men the salvation won by Christ, as is abundantly clear from the object of all of St. Paul's letters.

3) regarding the universal extension, as is certain from the letters written both to the Hebrews and to the Romans, and also from 1 Cor. 1:23-25; 9:19-22, *To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews; to those under the law I became as one under the law, that I might win those under the law. To those outside the law I became as one outside the law, that I might win those outside the law. I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. I do it all for the sake of the Gospel.*

108. B) In particular. 1) St. Paul was called by Christ immediately, chosen and sent, as is certain from the report of St. Luke, his disciple: Acts 9:3-6.15-16; and also from his relation to St. Paul: Acts 26:14-20: *I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you to serve and bear witness... I am sending you.*

2) To preach the Gospel of Christ, as he himself says: 1 Cor. 15:11-14; 1 Tim. 2:7: *I was appointed a preacher and apostle... a teacher of the Gentiles.*

3) Equal to each member of the College of the Twelve Apostles: a) *By his name:* for, he calls himself an Apostle at the beginning of his epistles, with the exception of five: 1 and 2 Thess., Phil., Philem. And Heb. b) *Also in reality,* for, he says that he is equal to the other Apostles: 2 Cor. 12:11: *For I am not at all inferior to these superlative Apostles.* With the unanimous interpretation of the Latin and Greek Fathers we understand these words to refer to the true Apostles.⁹

4) Recognized by the other Apostles as an Apostle: Gal. 2:7-10: *when they perceived the grace that was given to me... they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship* (see Pet. 3:15).

5) Confirmed as an Apostle by God by miracles: Rom. 15:16-19; 2 Cor. 12:12: *the signs of a true Apostle... with signs and wonders.*

109. C) The Apostolate of St. Paul can be proved sufficiently just from his letter to the Galatians:

1) 1:11-24 *he set me apart and called me to reveal his Son.*

9. See R. Cornely, *Comment* on this place and on 2 Cor. 11:5.

2) 1:6-9.15-16 *in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles.*

3) a) *By name: 1:1 Paul and Apostle; b) in reality: 2:7 I was entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised.*

4) 2:7-10 *when they perceived the grace that was given to me.*

5) 3:5 *he who works miracles among you... by hearing with faith.*

110. Scholium. The Mission that Christ gave to the Apostles is that which he had as man.

The identity of the mission of Christ and of the Apostles, which Leo XIII and Pius XII clearly teach (nn.97, 105, 1298-1303), is understood as the Legation and power that Christ has *as man*. According to the common teaching of theologians with St. Thomas, Christ could communicate this mission to other men, so that they might exercise it ministerially under the power of the excellence, that is, of the principal minister which Christ had *as man*, and under the power of the authority or of the principal agent, which Christ had *as God* and which could not be communicated to any creature. S.Th. III, q. 64, a. 3 and 4; see III, q. 7, a. 7; q. 12, a. 3; 4 CG 74; J. Salaverri, *El derecho en el misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 263-267.

111. Objections.¹⁰ 1. The Mission of Christ, as requiring a person of infinite dignity, is incommunicable. Therefore Christ did not commit his Mission to the Apostles.

I distinguish the antecedent. Regarding the act of redeeming and by his own authority founding the religion, *conceded*; regarding acts of applying the fruits of redemption and with vicarious authority continuing the work of Christ, *denied*. I distinguish the consequent in the same way.

2. *Objector insists:* The application and continuation of redemption take place finally through the power of infusing divine grace. But such power belongs to Christ alone. Therefore there cannot be the acts of others or a power of applying and continuing the work of Christ.

I distinguish the minor. The power of authority which belongs to Christ by reason of his divinity, and the power of excellence which belongs to Him by reason of his humanity substantially united to the divinity—these belong to Christ alone, *conceded*; the ministerial power by participation cannot be communicated by Christ to others, *denied*.

I distinguish the consequent in the same way. The acts or power of authority and excellence cannot be given to others, *conceded*; by ministerial participation, *denied*.

For the reason and explanation of this solution see St. Thomas III, q. 64, a. 3 and 4; see J. Salaverri, *La potestad de Magisterio*: EstEcl 29 (1955) 172.183ff.

112. 3. Matt. 5:17: Christ “did not come to abolish the law but to fulfill it.” Therefore he did not have a new mission which he would commit to the Apostles.

I respond with St. Thomas: I distinguish the antecedent. He did not come simply to

10. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.258.270; S.Th. I-II, q. 107, a. 1 and 2.

abolish the Old Law, but to complete and perfect it, *conceded*; he did not come to found the New Law in place of it, but merely to observe the Old Law, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Christ would not have a new mission which he would commit to the Apostles, if he had not come to establish the New Law but merely to observe the Old, *conceded*; if he came to establish the New Law by which he would complete and perfect the Old Law, *denied*.¹¹

The New Law does not intend simply to abolish the Old Law, but to complete and perfect it. The Old Law was figurative and promissory of the New, and therefore the Old Law was completed by the New Law, just as the figure by the truth and the promise by the fulfillment are completed. The Old Law was imperfect both by the objects of the precepts and by the power to fulfill them. The New Law perfected it by reason of the object, inasmuch as it is established¹² "to restrain not only the *hand*, but also the *will*"; and also by reason of virtue inasmuch as it imparts internal grace, which gives the powers necessary to observe the Law (D 1348).

113. 4. In Matt. 19:28 Jesus confers on the Apostles the power of judging only the twelve tribes of Israel. Therefore he did not give them his own mission and power, which were universal.

I distinguish the antecedent. The twelve tribes of Israel are understood spiritually to be all the heirs of the promises to Israel, *conceded*; only those are understood who are Israelites carnally, *denied*. See Rom. 9:6-8: "It is not the children of the flesh who are the children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned as descendants."

5. In Rev. 7:4-9 the twelve tribes of carnal Israelites are clearly distinguished from the others. Therefore the twelve tribes of Israel are to be understood about those who are Israelites carnally.

I distinguish the antecedent. They are distinguished from others by reason of their priority of divine election, *conceded*; by reason of the judgment by which they are to be admitted to the enjoyment of the reward, *denied*.

114. 6. Acts 1:17.21-22: *One of the men who have accompanied us... beginning from the baptism of John until the day when he was taken up from us—one of these men must become with us a witness to his resurrection.* St. Paul did not have these essential qualities of the Apostolate. Therefore he was not a true Apostle in the proper sense.

I distinguish the antecedent. These qualities are required for an individual to be one of the Twelve, *conceded*; for someone to be a true Apostle in the proper sense, *denied*.

7. 1 Cor. 15:9: *I am the least of the Apostles, unfit to be called an Apostle:* so St. Paul says that he is inferior to the other Apostles.

I distinguish. He says this out of humility by reason of his own demerits, *conceded*; by reason of his own real power of an Apostle, *denied*.

11. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* th.7: "According to the Gospels Christ indicated that he was going to abrogate the economy of the O.T. and he substituted for it a new religious order" (n.166-201). See above n.84-87; S.Th. I-II, q. 107, a. 2.

12. S.Th. I-II, q. 107, a. 1 ad 2.

115. 8. Gal. 2:2: *I laid before them the Gospel... lest somehow I should be running or had run in vain.* Hence St. Jerome says (*Epist.* 111,8): "Paul did not have the assurance of preaching the Gospel, unless he was strengthened by the approval of Peter and the Apostles." Therefore he thought he was inferior in authority to the other Apostles.

I distinguish the antecedent. Paul laid his Gospel before the other Apostles to make sure it was within the unity of the Church and in order to render his acceptance more easy, lest the lack of this approval might be a problem for those to whom he had preached or was going to preach, *conceded*; in order to obtain from the Apostles authority or because of fear that the Gospel he had received from Christ might not be true, *denied*.

116. 9. Praying... they laid their hands on Paul and sent him off: Paul received his mission from the Prophets and Teachers of the Church at Antioch. Therefore he did not have an immediate mission from Christ.

I distinguish the antecedent. Paul at that time received the episcopal ordination or a departing blessing, *conceded*; he received at that time the mission of the Apostolate, *denied*. For, *the Holy Spirit said to them: Set apart for me Saul... for the work to which I have called him* (Acts 13:2).

ARTICLE III

CHRIST HANDED OVER TO THE APOSTLES SOCIAL POWER

Thesis 3. Christ handed over to the Apostles the power of ruling, teaching and sanctifying, and he obligated men to submit themselves to this power. Hence he is the author of a hierarchical society, which he called Church.

117. S.Th. III, q. 72, a. 2 ad 1; *In 1 Cor* 12:28; *In Ephes* 41; Suarez, *Defensio fidei* 1.3 c.6-8; Franzelin, th.9; Palmieri, *Proleg.* 2 and 12; Ottiger, th.2; Dieckmann, n.313-342; D'Herbigny, n.102-149; Dorsch, p.84; Schultes, p.99; Lercher, th.27; Zapelena, th.7; Cotter, th.25-27; Straub, th.2; Bainvel, th.1; Wilmers, th.1 and 4.

118. Connection. In the preceding thesis we proved that Christ commissioned his Apostles to continue his divine Mission. Now we ask what the powers are in particular, which are understood to have been given to them under this conferred Mission, and what obligations for men flow from those powers.

119. Definition of terms. *Power* is a moral force, which among men is understood to be a fount of faculties, rights and obligations.

The power of ruling is the right of directing and obligating members of a human society to work for a common end.

The power of teaching is the right of handing on so that those to whom it is given are required to embrace it.

The power of sanctifying is the right of dedicating to God or uniting with God other people by means of some religious rite.

120. *A society* is a moral and stable union of several persons working together for the common good.

Social authority is the moral power of obligating the members of the society to union among themselves and working together for a common end.

The character of a society can vary by reason of the subject possessing the authority: hierarchical or democratic, monarchical, aristocratic, oligarchic, theocratic, patriarchal, etc.

All these names, *in virtue of the word itself*, signify diverse forms of government, which are specified by the subject holding the supreme authority.

121. Monarchical (μόνος-ἀρχή = the rule of one) is a society in which one physical person holds the supreme power.

Democratic (δημός-κράτος = the rule of the people) is a society in which the people hold the supreme authority.

In a similar way all the other forms of governing can be defined. Hence, *hierarchical* (ἱερά-ἀρχή = holy rule) will be a society in which a sacred person holds the supreme authority.

The person having authority in a hierarchical society is said to be *sacred*, especially because that person has been designated positively by God either immediately or mediately to perform that office.

122. All social power is from God, according to what St. Paul says: *there is no authority except from God* (Rom. 13:1). But the designation of the person holding the authority can be either from God or from the members of the society. When God positively designates the subject holding the power, then that person, whether physical or moral, designated by God truly is a minister of God and deservedly must be said to be *sacred*, since he has been positively appointed *by God* for that office.

In virtue of this divine designation the subject of power obtains his own rights, which the other members of the society lack; and hence there arises a hierarchical inequality, which according to the Fathers of the First Vatican Council is to be explained, "therefore, not only because some of the faithful are clerics and the others are lay persons; but especially for this reason, that in the Church there is divinely instituted power, which some have and which others do not have."¹

There can be a diversity of grades in participating in this power; because of this hierarchical grades have their origin. This variety of hierarchical grades is also called, especially by the canonists, *a sacred hierarchy* (CIC can. 108f. [1917]).

123. Adversaries.² The following deny that the *hierarchical form of the Church* was instituted by God: a) Marsilius of Padua, who derives ecclesiastical power from the civil authority (see D 942-945);

b) *Protestants*, holding that the Church is the community either of the saints or of the predestined, who conclude that there is no definite social form established by Christ, but only that some are chosen by the assembly of the faithful to the simple ministry of preaching and worship, and therefore are called *clerics* (D 1771);

1. *Schema I Constit. de Ecclesia* c.10: Msi 51,543.

2. P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme* (1927) 172-193.

c) Richer and the *Synod of Pistoia*, who hold that Christ gave all authority to the community of the faithful, from whom is derived to pastors the power of ecclesiastical ministry and government (D 2602-2603);

d) *Protestant jurists*, like Pufendorf, Boehmer and Jurieu, whose opinions the Vatican Council intended to condemn, when it prepared a definition on the Church as a divinely instituted hierarchical society.³ They taught that the Church is "an equal society" and in it "the power of the keys was given to the faithful people."

124. 2) Recent critical *Rationalists* deny that the social form of the Church was instituted positively by Christ; they agree in asserting that from Christ proceeds only individual faith in Christ or devotion to God the Father, which the faithful experienced; but in no way does the social and hierarchical order of the Church come from him.⁴ Using the method of form-criticism, chronologically they study the sources, beginning with the letters of St. Paul to the Thessalonians and to the Corinthians, and from them in various ways they explain the merely natural origin of the social constitution of the Church:

125. a) *The evolutionists* (Baur, Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Lightfoot, Weizsaecker) say that the faithful, motivated by the natural human tendency to form associations, established autonomous communities, which then because of internal reasons spontaneously developed into the particular churches, governed at first collegially by priests and then monarchically by Bishops. But through a confederation of the particular churches finally the universal Church of Christ was born.⁵

126. b) *The eclectics* distinguish a twofold organization in the Church; Hatch says that one was democratic presbyteral, while the other was monarchical episcopal, concerning which the Christians borrowed the first from the Jews but the second from the Hellenists. But Harnack thought that one was a merely juridical human organization of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, borrowed from others, by which the particular churches were administered; but the other form was religious, of Apostles, Prophets and Doctors, not confined to any one place; of these two forms the first absorbed the other already at

3. Msi 51,581ff.591ff. You can see the opinions of the Protestants in H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.544-555.

4. A. v. Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. I *Die Entstehung des kirchlichen Dogmas* (1909); Id., *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1920); A. Sabatier, *Esquisse d'une Philosophie de la Religion* (1897) l.2 c.2 (vers. Ovejero y Maury, Biblioteca Científico-Filosófica, 1912).

5. F.Ch. Baur, *Das Christentum und die christliche Kirche der drei ersten Jahrhunderte* (1860); M. Goguel, *L'idée d'Eglise dans le N.T.* (1939); F. Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube* (1836); A. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der alikatholischen Kirche* (1857); J.B. Lightfoot, *Epistle to the Philippians* (1878) dissertation I: *The Christian Ministry*, 181-269; J.A. Robinson, *The Christian Ministry* (1921); C. Weizsaecker, *Das apostolische Zeitalter* (1902).

the beginning of the second century. In our day Goguel holds the same view.⁶

127. c) *The charismatics* (Sohm) hold that ecclesiastical law is a denial of the Church of Christ; for, the Church is only an assembly of the faithful in order to offer a prayer of thanksgiving, with God himself directing it through those to whom he imparts the charismatic gifts of prophecy or teaching (1 Cor. 14). But when these charismatics were lacking, their place was taken by those who, pointed out by the Spirit through the prophets, were deputed by the elders for that role and were called Bishops. The juridical order was first introduced by the Roman Church when the Bishops were endowed with irremovable rights in the First Letter of Clement to the Corinthians, 44.1, at the end of the first century.⁷

d) *Congregationalists*, like Barth, who holds "that the Church is nothing other than the living Congregation of the living Christ the Lord, which lives to the extent in which it derives its own life from the action of its living Lord. Therefore, the Church is not a community, it is not a group of those who believe in Christ, and it is not an organism representing them under a monarchic, aristocratic or democratic form; but it is a mere event, in which two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ (Matt. 18:20). The governance of the living Congregation belongs exclusively to her living Lord. There are no other ecclesiastical offices, but only *plain service*, which they exercise in their own way and for which the members of the Congregation are responsible individually, so that all constituting *Hierarchy* is absolutely excluded. The distribution of ministries, which is de facto admitted, has as its only foundation the variety of *gifts* conferred by the Holy Spirit." E. Brunner for the same reason denies that there are stable juridical offices in the Church instituted by Christ, and he admits only a simple service of the charismatics, whose functions all the members of the Congregation exercise with an equal right.⁸

128. **Doctrine of the Church.** 1) *Christ instituted the Church as a society*: Vatican I implicitly taught this (D 3050-3052) and defined it (D 3053ff.). In the definition of the Vatican the word "society" is lacking, because it deals with the Primacy and the part about the Church could not be finished and promulgated, which had been prepared for definition. Leo XIII in "*Satis cognitum*" (D 1959 [34th ed.]) and Pius X in "*Lamentabili*" (D 3452) explicitly teach that the Church is a society instituted by Christ. Pius X (D 3537-3542) says that the institution was established by Christ "proximately and directly."

6. E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (1888); A.v. Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*: TU 2 (1884) 1-2; Id., *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts* (1910); M. Goguel, *Les prem. temps de l'Eglise* (1949) 122ss.165ff.

7. R. Sohm, *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholicismus* (1909); Id., *Kirchenrecht. I. Die geschichtl. Grundlagen* (1892, 2nd edition 1923).

8. K. Barth, *L'Eglise, Congrégation vivante de Jésus-Christ, le Seigneur vivant*: Desordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu, I p.95-107; W. Stolz, *Der Kirchenbegriff Emil Brunners*: DivThom (fr) 28 (1950) 293-312, 361-394; 29 (1951) 318-344. See n.43 note 6. See J. Salaverri, *El derecho en el misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 217-231.

Likewise Pius XII says: "The Church must be held to be a perfect society of its own kind..." For "the divine Redeemer willed that the assembly of men founded by him should be constituted as a perfect society of its own kind, and endowed with all the rights and social elements" (*"Mystici Corporis"*: AAS 35,222ff.). And in the *First Vatican Council* this clear definition was prepared: Draft I *on the Church*, cn.1: "If anyone says that the religion of Christ existed and was expressed in no particular society founded by Christ..., let him be anathema"; "If anyone says that the Church is not an external and visible society of the divine promises..., let him be anathema"; cn.10: "If anyone says that the Church is not a perfect society..., let him be anathema." In Draft II, cn.1 and 13, the same doctrine was proposed.⁹

129. 2) Leo XIII in "*Satis cognitum*" (D 1958 [34th ed.]) teaches that there is *in the Church a threefold power*, to which men must be subject. Pius XII in his Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*," teaches: "For when Christ himself was living on earth... he imparted to the Apostles and to their successors a threefold power; namely, of teaching, of ruling and of leading men to sanctity; and having established this power with its own precepts, rights and duties, he made it the primary law of the whole Church" (AAS 35,209). Therefore it is *divine and Catholic doctrine of faith*, setting aside the further question, whether and to what extent the power of teaching differs *specifically* from the power of ruling, or does not differ from it.

130. 3) *That the Church was instituted not as a democratic society, but as a hierarchical one* was defined against the Synod of Pistoia by Pius VI (D 2602); against the Protestants by the *Council of Trent* (D 1767-1770, 1776); against the Modernists by Pius X (D 3540); against other adversaries by *Vatican I* (D 3060ff.). Therefore it can be said to be *a matter of defined faith (de fide definita)*.

Moreover, the *Proposals of Vatican I* on the Church stated: Draft I, cn. 11: "If anyone says that the Church was divinely instituted as a society of equals; and that the office and ministry is had by the Bishops, but not their own power of ruling, which is conferred on them by divine ordination..., let him be anathema." Draft II, cn.3: "If anyone denies that there is a Hierarchy in the Church by divine ordination... established with the power or orders and jurisdiction... let him be anathema."¹⁰

131. Theological note. 1) That Christ instituted the Church as a society is *implicitly defined faith*; 2) That there is a threefold power in the Church is matter of *divine and Catholic faith*; 3) the Hierarchy is a matter

9. *Draft I* cn.1.3.10: Msi 51,539.551; II, cn.1.13: Msi 53,308.316.

10. Msi 51,552; 53,316. See Pius XII, "*Ad Sinarum gentem*": AAS 47 (1955) 9.

of *defined faith* (*de fide definita*).

State of the question. Since the divine institution of the Church is a fact, it is necessary to establish historically what Christ really did (D 3302). But from the sources the demonstration comes down to this: Christ immediately established authority in the group of disciples gathered around himself and he determined them as its subject; and he enjoined men that they should submit to this power. Therefore, according to these ideas he instituted immediately a hierarchical society.

132. Proof. I. Christ gave to his Apostles the power of teaching, sanctifying and ruling.

1) *In general*: Christ gave to the Apostles his own divine Mission. But the Mission of Christ included prophetic, priestly and royal power. Therefore Christ gave to the Apostles the power of teaching, of sanctifying and of ruling.

The major is certain from the preceding thesis. *The minor* was proved in the treatise on Christ the divine Legate. You can consult Ps. 2:6-8; Ps. 110:4; Deut. 18:18-19. The conclusion is evident.

133. 2) In particular: a) *The threefold power* is from Matt. 28:18: μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες διδάσκοντες τηρεῖν: make disciples—baptize them—teach them to observe. Given the nature of the meaning of a “disciple” in the Gospels, and also the command of the third element of instructing them on how to observe the commands of Christ, the quoted text must be rightly understood to refer not only to the power of teaching and sanctifying, but also to the power of ruling, as St. Jerome explained it so well when he said: “the Apostle commands that they first teach all the nations, then strengthen them with the sacrament of faith, and after faith and baptism to instruct them on what is to be observed.”¹¹

134. b) The power of teaching: Matt. 10:7.27: *proclaim upon the housetops*; Mark 3:14; 16:15: *preach the gospel to the whole creation*.

c) *The power of sanctifying*: with baptism John 3:5; with the Eucharist John 6:52.54; Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24; with repentance John 20:22.

11. *In Mt* 1.4 c.28 v.20: ML 26, 220. P. Joüon, *L'Evangile de N.S.J-Ch*. In Matt. 28:18f. In order to understand better the meaning of the text, consider it in the light of the messianic prophecy of Dan. 7:13f., to which Christ appeals before the tribunal of the Jews in favor of his Messiahship, Matt. 26:63f. In both texts the fullness, universality and perpetuity of power are manifest; Daniel announced this and Christ applies it to himself.

d) *The power of ruling*: Matt. 18:18: *whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven*. These words are directed to the Apostles, as is clear from Mark 9:33ff. In them he is speaking about social power, because all of chapter 18 deals with that. For, in this whole chapter the concern is with the pastoral office: vv. 1-14, on the way to attract men to the Church and to number them among the faithful; vv. 15-20, on the way of correcting and punishing the delinquent faithful; vv. 21-35, on the way of magnanimously receiving penitents.

135. The words themselves, *to bind-to loose*, correspond to the Aramaic words שר-א-אמר; if they are used in an antithesis and are referred to men, they mean the imposition or relaxation of a juridical or social bond. They are also used in this sense in the Gospels: Matt. 5:17 *I have not come to abolish the law*; John 5:18 *he broke the Sabbath*.

Therefore in Matt. 18:18 the words *bind-loose* signify a true social power, and indeed endowed with such amplitude that such power is extended to *whatever*, and with such power that its decrees are considered as ratified by God: *they will be bound-loosed in heaven*. But the authors interpret this power in two ways: some about the legal power of directly *forbidding* or *permitting*; but others about a doctrinal authority of *declaring* according to the law, that something is forbidden or permitted. But in both interpretations the words we are dealing with imply a power of ruling. Therefore with the words in Matt. 18:18 Christ gave the Apostles the power of ruling.

The major is proved by the exegesis of Matt. 16:19; 18:18.

In this matter the critics agree with Catholics, like Strack-Billerbeck and Buechsel in Kittel: "Without doubt the Aramaic words of the Rabbis *hasar* and *chera* underlie the Greek words δέειν and λύειν (Matt. 16:19; 18:18). The usual meaning of this rabbinic expression is also without doubt this: *with doctrinal authority to declare something forbidden or permitted*, or *to impose or remove an obligation*. Moreover, from Matt. 18:17 and from the almost unanimous interpretation of the Fathers, in particular it means also: *to inflict or remove an excommunication*, that is, *to exclude from the community or to admit someone back into it*. Strack (p.739-741) cites several examples of the use of the Rabbis, like this one: "Rabbi Jechonias about the year 70, before his lectures prayed like this: May it please you, Yahweh, my God and the God of my fathers, that it may never happen to my colleagues or to me, that we would dare *to forbid* (to bind = δέειν) what is *permitted* (loosed = λελυμένον) or *to permit* (to loose = λύειν) what is *forbidden* (bound = δεδεμένον)." ¹²

12. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrash*, I. *Das Evang. Nach Matthäus* p.738-747; Buechsel, in Kittel, *Theol. Wört. Zum N.T.* 2 (1950) p.59f; see D. Buzy in Pirot, *S. Bible* 9, *Ev. S. Matthieu* p.219f.; Karl Adam, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*. I. *Zum ausserkanonischen und kanonischen Sprachgebrauch von Binden und Lösen* (1936) 17-52; G. Lambert, *Lier-Déliier*: *RevBib* (1945) 91-103.

136. *The minor is proved.* For, in the first interpretation the words evidently signify the power of ruling, which can be reduced to forbidding or permitting men in an authoritative way to do something. But in the second interpretation the words signify the authority of deciding about the lawfulness of human actions, according to the law of Christ, which the Apostles have received from him. This authoritative decision regarding lawfulness, since it is considered as ratified by God himself, is really the highest and clearly the exercise of a right, and it does not have any power on earth superior to it. Therefore, it necessarily implies a true social power of deciding "whatever," according to the law received from Christ.¹³

137. II. Christ obligated men to submit themselves to the power given to the Apostles.

Mark 16:16 *he who believes will be saved, but he who does not believe will be condemned*; therefore under the danger of salvation one must give assent to the teaching which the Apostles have preached.

Matt. 10:32 *every one who acknowledges me I will also acknowledge him; whoever denies me, I also will deny him*; Matt. 10:40 *he who receive you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me*. See John 13:20.

Luke 10:16 *he who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me*.

Hence from what has gone before, we are certain that Christ immediately conferred social power on the group of his disciples, and that he designated the Apostles as its subject; but he obligated men to submit themselves to the Apostles. Therefore, he instituted immediately a hierarchical society that is obligatory for all men.

138. *Confirmation of this from the way of acting of the Apostles.*

A) The Apostles claim for themselves and exercise the power received from Christ of teaching, sanctifying and ruling, and they confirm it with miracles. Therefore they really received it from Christ.

I prove the antecedent. 1) in general: a) from the Acts of the Apostles. Acts 1—12 is a narration of the exercise of the threefold power of the Twelve Apostles and of the miracles by which God confirmed this apostolic authority. Acts 13—28 is a narration of the exercise of power and of the miracles of St. Paul.

b) *From the letters of St. Paul*, which deal with St. Paul's ministry of teaching, sanctifying and ruling the churches, and also by the miracles with which God confirmed the Apostolate of St. Paul.

I prove the antecedent. 2) in particular: The Apostles claim for themselves and exercise

a) *the power of teaching: the Twelve:* Mark 16:19-20; Acts 5:12-42; *St. Paul:* Rom. 1:1-15; 10:8-15; 15:16-19;

13. Leo XIII, "*Satis cognitum*": ASS 28,727; Knabenbauer, *In Mt* 16,19; Lagrange, *Evangile selon S.Mt* 16,19 (1952); J.M. Bover, *El Evangelio de San Mateo* (1946).

b) *the power of sanctifying: the Twelve*: Acts 2:14.37-42; *St. Paul*: 2 Cor. 5:17-21; 12:12;

c) *the power of ruling: the Twelve*: legislative, Acts 15:1-16; judicial, Acts 5:1-11; *St. Paul*: legislative, 1 Cor. 11:2.17-34; judicial, 1 Cor. 5:1-13; executive, 2 Cor. 13:1-4.10.

139. B) The powers of the Apostles are conferred only hierarchically and they are exercised only by hierarchs. Therefore the hierarchic order of the Church must be attributed to Christ, its author.

a) *They are conferred hierarchically: In choosing the successor of Judas* (Acts 1:16-26); in establishing, acknowledging and confirming the Apostolate of St. Paul (Gal. 1:1.12.18; 2:2.7-9); in choosing the presbyters of the churches (Acts 14:23); in ordaining Deacons (Acts 6:1-6).

b) *They are exercised by hierarchs*: In directing and governing the primitive community (Acts 2:37-43); in establishing or confirming other churches of Samaria (Acts 8:2-25) and Antioch (Acts 11:20-26); in oversight of the established churches (Acts 9:31; 15:360; in admitting Gentiles into the Church (Acts 10:1-48; see 1:8); in deciding the very serious question concerning the Judaizers (Acts 15:1-31).

140. Our thesis is confirmed against the Protestants:

Right from the first century of the Church up to the 16th century all Christians without doubt and unanimously held that the Church was instituted by Christ in the form of a hierarchical society. But a universal testimony, so ancient, constant and unanimous cannot not be true. Therefore Christ really instituted the Church in the form of a hierarchical society.

The major: Clement of Rome (+ ca. 96) (R 19-21) and also Ignatius of Antioch (+ ca. 107) (R 44, 48f., 65) taught this already in the first century.

After that time, all Christians, both Catholics and schismatics, thought exactly the same thing.

141. The minor. Such testimony cannot not be true, for a) it is certain about the knowledge of the witnesses from their antiquity and writings, b) and there can be no doubt about the veracity of their testimony, because if the hierarchical Church had not been established by Christ, it would not be held by all Christians with such unanimous consent through sixteen centuries, according to the evident axiom of natural reason: "What is found to be one among many, is not erroneous but handed on."¹⁴

142. III. Christ called the society, which he founded, the Church.¹⁵

14. Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* n.28: ML 2,40.

15. F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti lexicon*; K.L. Schmidt in Kittel, *Theol. Wört. Z. N.T.* 3 p.528-537; Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.336; P. Batiffol, *L'Église naissante et le catholicisme* 87; M. D'Herbigny, *Theol. De Ecclesia* n.29; W. Koester, *Die Idee der Kirche* p.1-7; A. Medebielle, *Eglise*: DBS; *Thes. Ling. Latin.* „Ecclesia“ 5 (19312) 32-40. Note that "at Antioch for the first time the disciples were called Christians" (Acts 11:26).

That Christ gave the name of "Church" to the society he founded is denied only by those who are forced to hold this opinion from the doctrines they maintain concerning the Church: namely, *Eschatologists*, because they do not want to admit that Christ willed to establish a religious society in the conditions of this time; *the Spiritualists*, because they think that Christ started only a merely internal religious movement; *the critical Rationalists*, because they attribute the origin of the Church to the followers of Christ who, motivated by merely natural causes, formed a society for themselves, which they said was instituted by Christ.

143. Ἐκκλησία is an apt word to signify the society which Christ instituted.

a) *From the etymological meaning of the word* and from its profane use: for Ἐκκλησία is derived from ἐκκαλεῖν, which means *to call*. It is used to signify a convocation produced by a herald, not of just any kind, but of citizens, in order to deliberate about public affairs. Therefore it implies the social concept of election and being called, which agrees very well with the society founded by Christ.

144. b) *From the use of the O.T.*, well known to Christ's hearers, whenever the word Ἐκκλησία occurs in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which is the translation of the original Hebrew, it is the translation of the word קהל which indeed, with one exception, occurs 72 times. But the word *Kahal* is found 132 times in the Old Testament and signifies in general an assembly of some kind of people. However, when it refers to pagans or to lost men then in Greek it is translated by the words ὄχλος or συναγωγή, but when it refers to a an assembly of the good or to a religious group, then, with one or two exceptions, the word *Kahal* is always translated with the word Ἐκκλησία. But the word קהל in the O.T. is always translated with the word συναγωγή.

But in these places Ἐκκλησία from the context almost always signifies a convocation of the chosen people for a religious purpose, and indeed in a universal sense, namely, to designate the whole theocratic people of Israel. Therefore it shows in its very concept the qualities of election, universality and assembling for a religious purpose, which agrees perfectly with the religious society founded by Christ.

145. c) *From the use of the Jews*, who were contemporaries of Christ. For, by them the words Ἐκκλησία and συναγωγή are used in almost the same sense, which we gather from the books of the Old Testament. Schürer points out that the difference between the two words lies in the fact that συναγωγή would designate rather the local communities, but Ἐκκλησία especially the universal society of those whom God called to salvation, or the whole chosen people of Israel.¹⁶

Hence among the Jews the word Ἐκκλησία signified primarily the gathering of the elect, whom God called to worship him in this life with true religion. Therefore, it was a word very apt to designate the religious society which Christ instituted.

16. F. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* 2,505; Strack-Billerbeck, *Das Evang. nach Matt.* 733f.

146. II) Ἐκκλησία is the word which Christ used to designate the society he instituted, although it was in the corresponding word of the Aramaic language.

a) It is certain that the word Ἐκκλησία must be referred to Christ himself, from Matt. 16:18; 18:17. For, the literary genuineness of these texts cannot now by anyone be denied justly, after so many critical editions of the text; but the historical genuineness is denied only because of the *a priori* reasons of the critical Rationalists, Eschatologists and Spiritualists. But the suppositions of these systems have already been shown to be erroneous in the preceding theses. Therefore, the word itself is to be referred to Christ as its author, since no good reason has been adduced because of which it would have to be denied to the Lord himself.

147. b) The same point is confirmed by the use of the word in the New Testament. For, in the books of the N.T. the word Ἐκκλησία occurs 112 times—3 in the Gospel of St. Matthew, 23 in the Acts of the Apostles, 63 in St. Paul, 20 in Revelation, 6 in the other letters of the Apostles. Indeed, by the authors of the New Testament the word Ἐκκλησία almost exclusively is used to designate communities of Christians, but the word συναγωγή is reserved for signifying the religious gatherings of Jews. But this constant use is very well explained by the supposition that Christ himself called the society founded by himself the “Church,” just as de facto St. Matthew (16:18; 18:17) testifies really happened. And this is further confirmed by the use of the word already in the primitive church in Jerusalem (Acts 5:11; 8:1-3; 9:31; 12:1-5).

148. c) Of course we do not know the actual Aramaic word used by Jesus, because the original Aramaic text of St. Matthew has been lost. However, since the word “Quehala” in the Aramaic language exactly corresponds to the Hebrew “Kahal,” it is correct to suppose that it, rather than the word “Kenischta,” was used by Christ.¹⁷

149. d) So the word Ἐκκλησία in Holy Scripture really has several meanings, as is sufficiently clear from what has gone before, but the following are the main ones:

1) The word *Church* means, *in the broadest sense*, the complex of those for whom Christ is the restorer, author of grace and giver of glory. Thus St. Paul (Col. 1:18). Under this concept are included the Church triumphant in

17. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.340; Th. Zahn, *Das Evang. Matth.* (1905) 540; K.L. Schmidt in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 3 p.529f. prefers kenischta.

heaven, suffering in purgatory and militant on earth.

150. 2) *Of the Church militant*, according to Holy Scripture, with St. Gregory the Great we can distinguish three stages, where he says: "The saints before the Law, the saints under the Law, the saints under grace—all these, completing the Body of Christ, are constituted as members of the Church."¹⁸

a) The *chosen people before the Law* are called the Church in the Desert of Sin, since they were on the way to Mount Sinai where the Law was given to them: Num. 20:4: *Why did you lead the Church of the Lord into the wilderness?* Acts 7:38).

b) The *Jewish people under the Law* are called the Church after Solomon's temple was built: 1 Kings 8:22: *Solomon stood before the altar of the Lord in the presence of the Church of Israel.*

c) The *hierarchical society of Christians* is called the Church and this is the most proper use of the books of the New Testament, whether it is said universally (Acts 20:28), or particularly about the local churches (Acts 15:41).¹⁹

151. Scholium 1. On the moment of time in which the Church was founded. We have proved that Christ instituted the Church. If one asks at what time Christ did this, we answer with Pius XII: "The divine Redeemer began to build the mystical temple of his Church when he was preaching and giving his commandments; he completed it when he hung on the Cross; he manifested and promulgated it by the visible mission of

18. St. Gregory the Great, *Epist.* 1.5 n.18 to John, the Bishop of Constantinople: ML 77,740 (R 2295); *Catech. Conc. Trident.* De Symb. A.9 n.7-9.17.

19. The particular and local meaning of the word Ἐκκλησία in the N.T. was thought to be primary and more ancient by many authors, especially non-Catholics: so also by some Catholics, like P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante* (1927) 90 and W. Koester, *Die Idee der Kirche beim Ap. Paulus* (1928) 15. But by others the contrary is held, which seems also to us to be more true, namely, that the universal meaning of the word was used among Christians first, who called the assembly of all the faithful of Christ "the Church of God," as also in a universal sense the "Kahal Yahweh" in the O.T. signified the universal people of God: thus H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.342,8.391f.; A.J. Mason, *Conceptions of the Church. Essays on the Early History of the Church*, edited by H.B. Swete (1921) 5-9; K.L. Schmidt, *Die Kirche des Urchristentums*, Festgabe f. A. Deismann (1927) 263-270; Id., Ἐκκλησία *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 502-539. See O. Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche* (1932) p.138-145; H. de Lubac, *Catholicisme. Les aspects sociaux du Dogme* (1938) p.28-33; F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 38-45. M. Meinertz, *Theologie des N.T.* (1950) 2 p.158.

the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, upon his disciples" ("*Mystici Corporis*": AAS 35,204).²⁰

152. According to the teaching of Pius XII (AAS 35,204.211), the building of the Church was consummated on the Cross, inasmuch as the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ the Head: or inasmuch as it is "Christ himself mercifully continuing on this earth his own work of the redemption of the human race, which he accomplished once for all on the wood of the Cross" (Msi 51,750).

Therefore it seems that it must be said that the Church was consummated on the Cross, not only considered absolutely, and according as it is the supernatural house of God built on Christ as its primary and proper foundation, or according as it is the moral body united with Christ as its primary and proper Head and therefore animated and vivified by the Spirit of Christ; but also inasmuch as the Church is the definitive social economy of salvation, which Christ per se instituted by way of a Testament, "when he handed on the norm of believing and living, instituted the sacrifice and the sacrament, established the pastoral ministry and hierarchical power"; then he formally and simply consummated the last will of the Testator with an immutable law. He himself ratified this irrevocably by his own death (see Msi 51,552; 53,315317; Heb. 9:15-17; 10:9-14).

153. Later the same Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Mediator Dei*" confirmed the same teaching when he wrote: "Christ established his Church as the pillar of truth and the dis-

20. *The opinions about the moment and act in which Christ really instituted the Church are:*

1) Christ really instituted the Church when, after the resurrection, he conferred the Primacy on Peter and powers on the Apostles: Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.2 n.6; Legrand in Migne, *Cursus* 4 p.41f.; Place: Msi51,753; J. Kleutgen: Msi 53,309; in treatises on the Church: Franzelin, 110f.; Palmieri, 2-8; Mendive, 127f.; Crosta, n. 324; Wilmers, n.25; De San, n.28-33; Van Laak, *Tract. dogmat.* 206; Billot, q.1 § 1; Straub, n.204; Muncunill, n.28 and 225; Zubizarreta, n.348; Ottiger, 224; Lercher (1927) n.270; De Guibert, n.67; Van Noort, n.10; Schultes, 50; Holzmeister: *VerDom* 7 (1927) 164.

2) Christ really and fully instituted the Church when he sent the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost: In treatises on the Church: De Groot, q.2 a.4 n.2; Hurter, 223-228; Bainvel, 37; Caruel, 250; Pesch, *Comp.* I n.211; D'Herbigny, n.54; Hervé (1949) n.279; Dieckmann, n.246; Goupil, 12; Egger, 399-402; Journet, 20-22; Zapelena, (1950) th.5; Murillo, *Jesucristo y la Iglesia* part 2 t.1 p.110f.; De la Taille, *Mysterium fidei* 332; Mersch, *Le Corps Mystique* I p.50; G. de Broglie, *L'Eglise nouvelle Eve*: *NouvRevTh* 67 (1945) 9ff.

3) The following hold in treatises on the Church that the Church was really and fully born on the Cross: Mazella, n.427. see however n. 444; Tanqueray, n.15; Michelitsch, § 164; Lercher, *Institut.Theol.* 4,1 (1945) n.39; J. Anger, *La doctrine du Corps Mystique* (1920) 235; S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (1937) 33-36, 104-105; Id., 1946) p. 41-115; M. Teixeira Lette, *O Corpo Mistico* (1944) 214; F. Grivec, *Skrivnostno telo Jezusa Kristus-Okozrnica PP. XII* (1944) 84; W. Bertrams, *De origine Ecclesiae*: *PerCanMor* 35 (1946) 241-235; Id., *Die Eigennatur des Kirchenrechts*: *Greg* 27 (1946) 543; Riedmann (1955) 45-52.

4) "Christ truly and perfectly instituted the Church when at the Last Supper, in a certain way anticipating the sacrifice of the Cross, he changed wine into his blood, saying: This chalice is the New Testament in my blood" (Luke 22:20); E. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 61f.

5) Among Catholics, the following hold that the Church was instituted at the Last Supper: Kattenbusch, *Der Quellort der Kirchenidee*, Festgabe für Harnack (1921) 169, and Wendland, *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes bei Jesus* (1931) 146f. These think that the Church was fully instituted on the day of Pentecost, Bonhöffer, *Sanctorum Communio*: *NeuStGeschThK* 26 (1930) 81, and Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 63. K.L. Schmidt thinks that the nature of the sources does not permit us to determine the moment of time in which Christ instituted the Church, *Die Kirche des Urchristentums*, Festgabe für A. Deismann (1927) 296; Id. In Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 3,525, see O. Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche* (1932) 178; L. Leuba, *L'institution et l'événement* (1950) p.90f.

penser of grace, and he founded it, consecrated it and established it by his own sacrifice of the Cross" (AAS 39 [1947] 527). Nevertheless, we think that there is no problem in our conceding that Christ himself, after his resurrection from the dead, really completed the building of the Church in the sense that, as the executor of the Testament consummated on the Cross, he began to apply the fruits of his redemption. Accordingly, he determined some social aspects of the Church, designated some subjects of duties and offices, and finally visibly poured out the promised gifts of the Holy Spirit.

154. Scholium 2. How the concepts of the Kingdom of God and the Church differ. The concept of the Church inadequately coincides with the concept of the Kingdom of God. For, the Kingdom of God is the supernatural economy of salvation positively established by the revelation of God, which was announced in the Old Testament and was established by Christ in the Messianic Kingdom. This Kingdom exists in two stages—one of the way or preparation in the conditions of this life, the other of the fatherland or consummation continuing forever in the next life.

But the Church, in the strict sense, is the Kingdom of God existing in the conditions of this life and as it was de facto constituted socially by Christ.²¹

155. Scholium 3. Different meanings of the word "Church." St. Thomas uses the word "Church" with various meanings.²²

a) *In the broadest sense* he calls the Church "the body of those who are ordained to the glory of the divine fruition, and so the body of the Church consists not only of men but also of angels."

b) *In the broad sense* "the body of the Church is constituted by those of whom Christ is the Savior, that is, of the men who have been from the beginning of the world until its end."

c) *In the less broad sense* he distinguishes the Church "according to the status of

21. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.27-29.85ff. L. Cerfaux, *L'Eglise et le Règne de Dieu*: Recueil L. Cerfaux (1954) II p.365-387. On the relation between the Church and the Kingdom of God, the Rationalists and the first Eschatologists held that Christ did not plan to establish a permanent society, but only intended a Kingdom, either merely spiritual and internal (Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Sabatier Harnack), or only one to be established at the end of the world (J. Weiss, Schweitzer, Loisy, Schnitzer). But the contemporaries, like K. Barth, G. Gloege, H.D. Wendland, K.L. Schmidt, say that not only the Kingdom of God but also the Church has Christ as its author, however in his mind the Kingdom is only transcendent and triumphant, while on the other hand the Church is only temporal and militant, and therefore between the Kingdom and the Church they establish an absolute distinction and opposition, although they do concede that the Church is ordered to the Kingdom as an instrument of God in which the power of the King acts efficaciously: K. Barth, *Die Kirche Jesu Christi* (1934); Id., *Credo* (1935); G. Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche im N.T.* (1929); H.D. Wendland, *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes* (1931); K.L. Schmidt, *Royaume-Eglise*: *RevHistPhRe* 18 (1938) 145-173. See F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 151-158. On the Rationalists and first Eschatologists, see thesis 1.

22. St. Thomas on the meaning of the word "Church": a) *in the broadest sense*, III, q. 8, a.4; b) *broad*, III, q. 8, a. 3; c) *less broad*, III, q. 8, a.4 ad 2; 4 CG 76; d) *in the strict sense*, III, q. 8, a. 3 and ad 3; II-II, q. 4, a.5 ad 4; see St. Augustine, *Enar. in Ps* 90,2,1: ML 37,1159 (R 1479); *in the strictest sense*, 1 *Sent.* d.16 q.1 a.2 and ad 4; *Quodl.* 12 q.13 a.19.

the fatherland" which he calls "triumphant" and which he defines as "the congregation of comprehensors," from the Church "according to the state of the way," which he calls "militant" and which he defines as "the congregation of the faithful."

156. d) *In the strict sense*, those who belong actually to the Church militant are divided into two classes: one of those who are united with Christ in charity, but the other of those who are united only by faith; and because "the ancient Fathers were borne to Christ by the same faith and love whereby we also are borne to him." and therefore also "they belong to the same Church as we." Hence the meaning is clear by which St. Thomas defines the Church militant as "the congregation of the faithful" both of the Old and of the New Testament, and why he says that "formless faith is common to all members of the Church."

157. e) *In the strictest sense* he understands the Church as that which began with Christ and the Apostles. Such is the Church which "was planted by the Apostles," and which continues after their death, for "the Church which now exists is the exact same Church that existed at the time of the Apostles; because it has the same faith and the same sacraments, the same authority, the same profession."

158. F. Suarez for the same reason distinguishes the Church, which he defines with St. Thomas as "the congregation of the faithful," who have believed in Christ beginning from Adam to the end of the world, from the Church "according to the special way which it claims for itself from the institution of Christ, which as it now is, was instituted by Christ the Lord," and indeed "from the beginning of his preaching Christ began to lay its foundation, but he did not completely finish the building until about the time of the Ascension, when he said to Peter: *Feed my sheep*." In the Catechism of the Council of Trent we read: "those who came from Adam, and those who will come from him in the future, as long as the world exists, those professing the true faith belong to the same Church."²³

159. Objection.²⁴ 1 Pet. 2:5: All the faithful are equally priests: *A holy priesthood.*

I distinguish. In the broad sense, inasmuch as by baptism and confirmation they are similar to the eternal Priest and must offer spiritual sacrifices as members of the body of the Church, *conceded*; in the strict sense or as endowed with hierarchical power, *denied*.

2. 1 Tim. 2:5: *For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus*: Christ as the unique mediator excludes any hierarchy.

I distinguish. As the necessary, principal mediator and meritorious cause, *conceded*; as freely established by God, ministerial and applying in an instrumental way the merits of the redemption, *denied*.

3. Neither God as the principal cause, nor the effect of sanctifying grace can allow

23. F. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.2; *Catechismus Conc. Tridentini* part I a.9 n.17. See also Suarez, *De fide* d.12 s.4 n.22; Y. Congar, *Ecclesia ab Abel*: Festschrift für Karl Adam (1952) p.79-108.

24. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.4 and 7.

for any human instruments.

I distinguish. Necessary, *conceded*; freely established by God and divinely elevated to produce the effects in virtue of the principal cause, *denied*.

160. 4. Luke 22:25. All domination is excluded: *The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you.*

I distinguish. Abusive, *conceded*; ordained, *denied*.

5. Acts 15:6.22f. The power of making universal laws seems to belong to the whole Church: *It seemed good to the Apostles and the elders, with the whole Church.*

I distinguish. Under the hierarchical authority of the Apostles, *conceded*; so that in making this decision the power of all would be equal, *denied*.

6. 2 Cor. 2:6-10. The community itself exercised authority and decided: *For such a one this punishment by the majority is enough... Any one whom you forgive, I also forgive.*

I distinguish. With authority received from Paul to carry out his command, *conceded*; with their own authority to impose a new command, *denied*. See 1 Cor. 5:3-13.

7. Matt. 20:23: Christ did not have any faculty of granting offices or powers in his Kingdom. Therefore he could not hand on any powers to his Apostles.

I distinguish the antecedent. Christ did not have any faculty of granting powers according to the choice of men and independently of the Father's will, *conceded*; by his own choice according to the will of the Father, *denied*.

8. 1 Cor. 12:11: In the Church *all these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills*. Therefore any other powers of men are excluded and superfluous.

I distinguish the antecedent. As the first cause, primary or principal, which by ministerial participation is worthy to use second causes or secondary instrumental causes, *conceded*; as the only cause, *denied*.²⁵

25. S.Th., *De verit.* q.11 a.1; I, q. 22 a.3; III, q. 64 a.3 and 4; J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el misterio de la Iglesia: RevEspT 14 (1954) 263-267.*

CHAPTER II

On the institution of the monarchic Church

ARTICLE I

CHRIST PROMISED TO ST. PETER A PRIMACY OF JURISDICTION

Thesis 4. Jesus immediately and directly promised to St. Peter a Primacy of jurisdiction or supreme authority over the whole Church.

161. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 10; q. 11, a. 2 ad 3; III, q. 8, a. 6; 4 CG 76; *In Mt.* 16:17-19; St. Bellarmine, *Controv.* 3.1.1 c.1-13; F. Suarez, *De triplici virtute theologica* d.5 s.8 n.1; *Defensio fidei* l.3 c.10-11; Th. Granderath, *Const. Dogm. Conc. Vatic.* 129; I. Ottiger, 2 p.61-212; A. Straub I th.3f.; D. Palmieri, th. 1f. p.292; L. Billot, I p.528; J.V. de Groot, q.14 p.492; M. D'Herbigny, th.15; H. Dieckmann, th.13f.; E. Dorsch, th.6; J. Muncunill, n.39; R. Schultes, c.6 a.42; T. Zapelena, I th.8; A.C. Cotter, th.28; L. Lercher, th.29; DTC 13,247-262; DBS 2,245-590; RealEncyKlassAltWiss 19, 1335-1361; M. Meinertz, *Theol. des N.T.* (1950) I 69-79; J. Ludwig, *Die Primatworte Mt 16,18f. in der altkirchlichen Exegese* (1952); O. Karrer, *Um die Einheit der Christen: Die Petrusfrage* (1953); O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952).

162. Connection. 1) In the preceding thesis we proved that Christ instituted the Church as a hierarchical society and in it constituted the College of Apostles as the subject of social power. 2) Now we are asking whether by the institution of Christ the hierarchical Church is an oligarchic society in which the college of equals possesses the supreme power, or is it monarchic, in which one physical person holds the supreme social power. 3) The thesis answers this, and then says that Christ determined for the Church: a) a monarchic government in particular, b) and that he designated the person of St. Peter as the subject of the supreme social power.

163. Definition of terms. *Primacy*, in virtue of the word itself, is a title by which someone is said to be first in some matter. By a primacy of honor someone is said to be the first in honor (Dean of the College of Cardinals). By a primacy of direction someone is said to be first in direction or endowed with the faculty only of advising and warning, not of commanding¹ (Presider of the Senate). By a primacy of governing someone is said to be first with governing power (Father of a family). *By a primacy of jurisdiction* someone is said to be first with the right of authority in a perfect society.

For, *jurisdiction* is authority in a perfect society. A *perfect society* is said

1. D 2605; Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum*: ASS 28,726.

to be one whose purpose is the supreme good in its own field and possesses sufficient means really or by right in order to obtain that end. Accordingly a perfect society is not part of any other society nor is it directly subordinate to another.

164. The words “immediately and directly” are to be understood as Vatican Council 1 explained them (D 3053-3054 at the end), and according to the observations of the same Council: “The words ‘immediately and directly’ are against the Richerians, who attributed to Peter and his successors only a ministerial power, and they also say that the divinely instituted Primacy was not given immediately or directly to Peter, but to the Church as its proper subject, in whose name Peter accepted it.”²

Hence, for the Primacy to be promised to Peter *immediately* means that the promise of the Primacy is made by Christ *immediately to Peter himself*, not through the mediation of the Apostles or the Church; for the Primacy to be promised to Peter *directly* means that the words, whereby the promise is made to Peter, express *directly* the Primacy itself, not some other prerogative, from which the Primacy might follow or in which it might be contained.

165. We are saying, for the sake of clarification, *a Primacy of jurisdiction or the supreme power*, because, that which in this thesis strictly suffices to prove it, is that Christ promised to give Peter *the supreme power* in the society established by him. That this supreme social power is in particular a power of *jurisdiction* follows necessarily from the thesis, in which later we will have to prove that the Church is a perfect society, whose proper power is that of jurisdiction, as is clear from the definition of terms.

166. Adversaries. Before the 19th century and after that the following *deny the Primacy of St. Peter*:

1) *Schismatic Orientals*. All acknowledged him up to the 12th century; even Photius recognized him, although at times in a polemical way he spoke about him incorrectly. Later a few Orientals denied the Primacy of Peter from the middle of the 12th century; it was common in the 14th century, but from the 16th century down to our own times almost all schismatic Orientals refuse to admit the Primacy of St. Peter.³

2. Msi 51,599. In the first draft of the Constitution on the Church, observation 26.

3. M. Jugie, *Theol. dogmat. Christianorum Orientalium* 4 (1931) 320-350; 5 (1935) 42-46 (teaching of the Nestorians), 389-394 (teaching of the Monophysites); M. Gordillo, *Compend. Theologiae Orientalis* (1939) c.3; see S. Zankow, *Das orthodoxe Christentum des Ostens* (1928) 135-139; Ch. Papadopoulos, *Το Πρωτεῖον του Ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης* (1930); see OrCh 18 (1930) 63; F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 220-224.

2) In the 14th and 15th centuries Marsilius of Padua, Hus and Wycliffe also denied the Primacy of St. Peter (D 942, 1207, 1263).

3) Then from the 16th century the *Protestants* generally have denied it, following their leaders Luther and Calvin (D 1475f.).⁴

4) In the 17th century the *Gallicans* with E. Richer and the *Jansenists* with Barcos, and in the 18th century Febronius and the *Synod of Pistoia* (D 1999, 2592-2597, 2603 with the note).

167. 5) In the 19th and 20th centuries, all *Rationalists* and *Modernists*, who, in order to make the denial of the Primacy of St. Peter more plausible, advance especially the following three theories.

A) *The theory of interpolation* (Resch, Soltau, Goguel, Harnack and several others), which denies completely the literary genuineness of Matt. 16:18, or says that St. Matthew did not write the pericope of the Primacy, but that it was interpolated later into his Gospel by someone else.

168. B) *The theory of idealization or form-criticism* (Loisy, Dell, Bultmann and very many others), which indeed acknowledges and defends the literary genuineness of the text of St. Matthew, but denies totally the historical genuineness of the same text. They say that such words were not spoken by Christ and that their meaning is not to be ascribed to Christ, but that in them St. Matthew is merely expressing an idea which the primitive Church created for itself about St. Peter. This theory was popular among critics during the first decades of the 20th century, but afterwards it was abandoned by almost all. But then from about the year 1941 it was taken up again, especially by Bultmann and Kümmel; Haller followed them, and in our time it has many advocates among non-Catholics and also many who oppose it.⁵

169. C) *The theory of interpretation* (Seeberg, Sohm, Billerbeck, Wendland and innumerable others, who propose the opinions of the first

4. Luther, *Responsio ad librum Ambrosii Catharini* ed. Weimar, 7,709.719: "The word of Christ in Matt. 16 does not pertain to any person, but only to the Church in the spirit built on Christ the rock. This place in Matthew speaks only about the pious buildings in the Holy Spirit; it is not about Peter but about Christ and refers only to the whole Church, catholic and holy, in which Peter himself as a member is built on the same Rock which is Christ."

5. R. Bultmann, *Die Frage nach der Echtheit von Mt, 17-19*: TheolBlät (1941) 265-310; W.G. Kümmel, *Kirchenbegriff und Geschichtsbewusstsein in der Urgemeinde*: SymbBiblUpsal (1943); Jo. Haller, *Das Papsttum I* (1950) 4-6, 472-475; A. Oepke, *Der Herrspruch über die Kirche Mt16,17-19 in der neuesten Forschung*: StudTheol 2 (1950) 110-165: Oepke defends the historicity, but of the 34 authors whom he cites, about half of them attack it (p.111); see O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) p.151ff.; J. Hamer, *Une orientation de la pensée protestante*: RevNouv 17 (1953) 639-650; W.G. Kümmel, *Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche*: StudTheol 7 (1953) 1-27.

Protestants somewhat modified), which acknowledges the literary and historical genuineness of the text, but it explains the words of the Lord “upon this rock” in various ways, so that they signify—either on Christ whom Peter has confessed, or on all the Apostles together in whose name Peter answers, or on the faith of Peter and of all the faithful, who like Peter have faith in Christ that Jesus will build his Church.⁶

170. Doctrine of the Church. On the occasion of defending or defining the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, indirectly they also defended the Primacy of St. Peter:

In the 9th century, at the time of Photius, St. Nicolas I wrote to the emperor Michael (D 640). In the 11th century, in a letter to Michael Cerularius (D 351, 353 [34th ed.]). In the 14th century, in letters to the Catholicon of the Armenians, Clement VI (D 1053). In the 15th century, on the occasion of the union of the Orientals, the *Council of Florence* (D 1307). Jugie (4,333) says that at Florence there was no question about the Primacy of Peter.

171. Finally, Vatican Council I (1870) defined explicitly and directly that the Primacy was promised by Christ directly and immediately to St. Peter, and in fact with the words of the Lord found in Matt. 16:17-19 (D 3053). But the errors excluded by this definition of the Vatican were explained by the Secretary of the same Council, when he said: “The doctrine of the Primacy of St. Peter is opposed especially to two errors: 1) *To the error of the heretics and schismatics*, who either absolutely and simply deny that the divine jurisdiction of the Primacy was instituted by Christ, or they place the primary authority and center of the whole Church in a supreme holy Synod. And 2) *To the error of the Richerian innovators* and of others, who approve the Primacy, but who say that the office of jurisdiction was at first handed over immediately and essentially by Christ to the Church, and through her it was given to Peter as her minister.”⁷

Leo XIII in his Encyclical “*Satis cognitum*” gave a further accurate exegesis of Matt. 16:17-19: “Jesus Christ, therefore, appointed Peter to be the head of the Church... And so he made that remarkable promise to Peter and to no one else: *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church* (Matt. 16:18)... From this text it is clear that by the will and command of God the Church rests upon St. Peter, just as a building rests

6. See F. Heiler, *Das Wort vom Kirchenbau auf Petrus: Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 48-61; F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 80-96; R. Baumann, *Des Petrus Bekenntnis und Schlüssel* (1950); O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) 139-214; O. Karrer, *Die Petrusfrage* (1953).

7. Ludovicus Pie in the fiftieth general Congregation on May 13, 1870: Msi 52,30.

on its foundation... It is consequently the office of St. Peter to support the Church and to guard its unity with all his strength. How could he fulfill this office without the power of commanding, forbidding, and judging, which is properly called *jurisdiction*?... This, furthermore, Christ gave: *To thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven*... The Church is typified not only as an *edifice*, but as a *Kingdom*, and every one knows that the keys constitute the usual sign of governing authority. Wherefore when Christ promised to give to Peter the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, he promised to give him power and authority over the Church... In this same sense He says: *Whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth it shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in Heaven*. This metaphorical expression of binding and loosing indicates the power of making laws, of judging and of punishing; and the power is said to be of such amplitude and force that God will ratify whatever is decreed by it. Thus it is supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church, and all things committed to the Church" (ASS 28,726f). This doctrine about the Constitution of the Church "per se demands assent" (Pius XII, Encyclical "*Humani generis*": AAS 42,568).

172. Theological note. The thesis is *defined divine faith* in the Councils of Florence and Vatican I (D 1307, 3053-3054).

The proof is given in *three* steps so that it responds to the *threefold theory* of recent adversaries, which we mentioned above under 5). Therefore, first of all we have to defend the literary genuineness of the text of St. Matthew, then the historical genuineness of the same text, and finally we have to establish the true interpretation of the Lord's words.

173. 1. The literary genuineness of Matt. 16:18 is vindicated.

A) A. Resch and J. Schnitzer say that the words in Matt. 16:18: *And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the powers of hell shall not prevail against it*, were interpolated towards the end of the 2nd century, because they are not cited by the authors up to Tertullian and Origen at the beginning of the 3rd century. J. Grill has dared to assert further that the interpolation was done in Rome, about the year 190, during the time of Pope Victor. But W. Soltau, admitting that the text was known to St. Justin, says that the interpolation was made a little after the year 130.⁸

8. A. Resch, *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien*: TU 10 (1896); J. Schnitzer, *Hat Jesus das Papsttum gestiftet? Das Papsttum eine Stiftung Jesu?* (1910); J. Grill, *Der Primat des Petrus* (1904); W. Soltau, *Wann ist Matth. 16,17-19 eingeschoben*: ThStKrit 89 (1916) 233-237; M. Goguel, *Trois études sur la pensée religieuse du christianisme primitif* (1931); *Jésus et l'Eglise*: RevHistPhRel 13 (1933) 224; W.G. Kümmel, *Die Eschatologie der Evang.* (1936).

174. B) A. Harnack says that only the words *and on this rock I will build my Church* (Matt. 16:18) were interpolated around the year 120 during the time of the Emperor Hadrian (117-138). The principle reason he gives is this: because in the *Diatesseron*, that is, the *Harmony of the Gospels* by Tatian (about 170) (the work has been lost and we get an imperfect knowledge of it from the works of St. Ephraem), the reading was: "You are Peter, and the powers of death shall not prevail against you," and with these words immortality was promised to Peter. However, after Peter died, in order to correct this error, the words were interpolated: "and on this rock I will build my Church." So after that the word "it" was substituted for the word "you."⁹

175. Contrary to these theories of interpolation, the *literary genuineness* of the text of Matt. 16:18 must be admitted.¹⁰

A) 1) *Because it is present in all the codices and ancient versions*, as all the critical editions made both by Catholics and by non-Catholics have demonstrated irrefutably. In the *Syro-sinaitic* codex a whole page is missing, in which our text should be found; but as such a page should be correctly written, by a calculation made of the number and length of the lines and letters, the conclusion is that it would have to include Matt. 16:17-19. This point is confirmed, because our text is included in the Syrian version, made in the 2nd century and transcribed into a codex in the 5th century, which was edited by Cureton, and from thence it is called *Syro-Curetonian*. The Curetonian text agrees with the *Syro-sinaitic* text so that there are two versions of the same original of the 2nd century; and therefore Matt. 16:17-19 could not be lacking in the *Syro-sinaitic* text.

176. 2) *Because the text is even cited by authors of Christian antiquity* or allusions are made to it. Thus it is cited by the *Gospel of the Hebrews*, either in the year 70 according to Harnack, or about 100 according to Lagrange, or at least before the year 135 according to other authors. Thus in the *Odes of Solomon* before the year 150. Thus also by the *Shepherd Hermas* and St. Justin about the year 150, by St. Irenaeus about 180, by Tertullian and Origen about the year 200. Of these Origen, a most learned, zealous and careful student of the texts of Scripture, had access to the without doubt

9. A. Harnack, *Tatian's Diatesseron... bei Ephraem Syrus*: ZKG 4 (1881) 471-505; Id., *Der Spruch über Petrus als den Felsen der Kirche*: SitzBPAkadWiss (1918) p.637-654.

10. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.345-357; M. D'Herbigny, *Theologica de Ecclesian.* 170-174 and 378 note 1; A. Medebielle, *Eglise*: DBS 545-585; L. De Grandmaison, *Jésus Christ* 2 (1929) 63-65; S. Rosadini, *Instit. introd. in libros Novi Testamenti* (1938) I n.129; J. Knabenbauer-A. Merk, *Commentarius in Evang. Secundum Matth.* 2 (1922) 576f.; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante* (1927) 93-113; K.L. Schmidt in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 3 (1950) 523-527.

best and most ancient codices of the sacred books, especially in the large libraries in Alexandria and in Caesarea in Palestine. Therefore his certain testimony for the unanimous tradition concerning our text has conclusive value.¹¹

177. 3) *Because the text shows a Semitic coloring*, which both Catholic and non-Catholic critics unanimously acknowledge, concerning these words: “Blessed,—Bar Jonah,—flesh and blood,—the powers of hell,—to bind and to loose”; and it uses expressions proper to the Gospel of St. Matthew, such as: “The Kingdom of Heaven,—Father who is in heaven.” The play on the words *πέτρος πέτρα* cannot have a Greek origin, but rather translates the Aramaic original of *Kepha-Kepha*. The circumlocution, which is made by using the passive voice, *will be bound, will be loosed*, along with the name of the place of heaven to refer to God, so that the pronunciation of the ineffable name of God can be avoided, is typically Semitic. Therefore it must be rightly concluded that the text was not interpolated into the Greek version, as non-Catholics say, but must be attributed to the original Aramaic text.¹²

4) Because the interpolation, or falsification, was made with such cleverness by reason of the form (the Aramaic color), with such audacity by reason of the matter (the divine Sonship of Christ, the foundation of the Church and its Primacy), and with such great and universal success that there is no trace of any contradiction, it is absolutely improbable.

178. B. 1) *Concerning the explanation given by Harnack*, something else must be said: a) it is absurd to say that St. Matthew wrote *in the year 70*, as Harnack holds, the words “the powers of hell shall not prevail against you,” signifying the *immortality* of Peter, since Peter had already died, even according to Harnack in the year 64.

b) It is false to conclude, from the quotes of two books of St. Ephraem, that Tatian has only the text, which Harnack says he had, since from several other citations and allusions of St. Ephraem and Aphraates, with equal right

11. *Evang. Hebr.* In TU 5,3,1-42; see Lagrange, *L'Evangile selon les Hebr.*: RevBibl 31 (1922) 161-181, 321-349; *Odiae Salom.* 22,12 in Lietzmann, *Kleine Texte* 64. *Pastor Hermæ*, Vis. 3,2-7; Sim 9, in Funk, *PP. Apost.* I 434-448, 576-634; see L. Fonck, *Tu es Petrus*: Bibl 1 (1920) 262; St. Justin, *Dial.* 100,106; MG 6,709.724; St. Irenæus, *Adv. haeres.* 3,13,2; 18,4; 21,8; 24,2; MG 7,912, 934-953.967; Tertull., *De praescr.* 22,4; *De pudic.* 21 (below n. 226). Origen, *In Exod.* Hom.5,4; *In Rom.* 5,10 (below n.234); Id., *In Mt* 16,13-20 t.12 n.9-15; MG 13,993-1020, where he discusses the variant readings of verse 20 (1016f.), but he does not mention any variant readings of verses 13-19 on which he comments.

12. See H.L. Strack-Billerbeck, *Das Evang. nach Matth. erläutert aus Talmud und Midrash* (1922); K.L. Schmidt, J. Jeremias in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 3 (1950) 523-527, 749-751; J. Huby, *L'Evangile* (1954) 114.

one can conclude that they read in Tatian our whole text. St. Ephraem in commenting on Isa. 62:2 says: "And you shall be called by a new name, the holy Church; the mouth of the Lord will impose this name, saying: upon this rock I will build my Church, and the strong bars of hell will not overcome it." And in the harmonizing of the Gospel, just after the words on which Harnack bases his theory, St.

Ephraem himself goes on to say: "The Lord, when he built his Church, built a tower, whose foundation is such that it will support everything that is built on top of it... You are the rock, that rock, which he established, so that he might repulse Satan with it. On the contrary, Satan wanted to turn this rock against the Lord, to overcome him with it, when Peter said to the Lord: Lord, this shall never happen to you..."¹³ In these words a real paraphrase of our text of Matt. 16:18 is clearly apparent. Finally, in the Arabic version of the 11th century of the work of Tatian, and in the Latin version of the year 540, the whole text of Matt. 16:13-20 is contained.¹⁴

179. c) Rightly, therefore, the theory of Harnack has been abandoned by all, so that E. Nestle in the critical apparatus of his edition of the New Testament in 1923 said: to read in Tatian "the powers of hell shall not prevail against you" in all later editions this sentence is missing. Indeed Harnack himself, three years before his death, in 1927 wrote: concerning Matt. 16:18 "it is doubtful whether the word *Church* is original, or was later interpolated"; therefore he admitted that all the other words are genuine.¹⁵

13. St. Ephraem of Syria, *Evangelii concordantis expositio ex vers. armeniaca translata* by J.B. Ancher, ed. G. Moesinger (1976) c.14 p.153f.; St. Ephraem, *Sermones in Hebdom. Sanctam* 2 n.4; 4 n.1; *ad Nocturnum Dom. Resurrect.* N.2; ed. T. J. Lamy, 1,374.412.531; Id., *Comment. in Isaiam* 62,2; ed. Lamy 2,186; Aphraates, *Demonstrationes* 7,15; ed. Graffin-Parisot, *Patrologia syriaca* 1,335.

14. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apocriphen* 72-75; A. Ciasca, *Tatiani Evangeliorum Harmoniae arabice cum translatione latina* (1888) 42; Victor Ep. Capuan, *Interpretatio evangelicarum Harmoniae*: ML 68,299; this version is contained in the *Vulgatae codice Fuldensi*, 6th century, edited by Ranke (1868). See Vaccari, *Institut. biblic.* L.3 n.40; Cornely-Merck, *Introd. in Script. Compendium* (1929) n.108; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirch. Literatur* 1,253-260.

15. Non-Catholics rejected the explanation invented by Harnack: H. Windisch: *ThLitZg* 44 (1919) 197; E. Meyer, *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* I (1921) 112; F. Kattenbusch, *Der Quellort der Kirchenidee*: Festgabe A. v. Harnack (1921) 165-168; R. Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte* I (1922) 100; Th. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Matthäus* (1922) Exkurs p.725ff. But the Catholics unanimously demonstrated its falseness: L. Fonck, *Tu es Petrus*: *Bibl* 1 (1920) 240-264; P. Schepens: *RechScRel* (1920) 269-302; J. Sickenberger, *Eine neue Deutung der Primatsstelle*: *ThRev* 10 (1920) 1-7; C.A. Kneller, *Über die ursprüngliche Form von Matt 16,18*: *ZkathTh* 44 (1920) 147-169; S. Euringer, *Der locus classicus des Primates Mt 16,18 und der Diateserontext des hl. Ephraem*: Festgabe f.A. Ehrhard (1922) 141-179; H. Dieckmann, *Neuere Ansichten über die Echtheit der Primatsstelle*: *Bibl* 4 (1923) 189-200; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante* (1927) Excursus A. Valeur de Mt 16:18-19 p.95-113. A. Harnack, *Christus praesens-Vicarius Christi*: *SitzBPAkadWiss* (22-12-1927) ed. 1028 p.415ff.: "An der Stelle (Mt 16,180 ist noch immer zweifelhaft, ob die Kirche ursprünglich ist ob sie nicht später eingeschoben ist."

180. 2) *The argument from silence* in Mark 8:29 and Luke 9:20, which the non-Catholics propose, proves too much; therefore it proves nothing. For, it would prove that all three verses 17, 18 and 19 are not genuine, which indeed these authors do not dare to assert. But for the argument from silence to prove something, it would have to be shown that Mark and Luke could not refrain from writing the same thing that Matthew wrote. Similar omissions of Matt. 14:28-31; 17:24-27 occur in Mark 6:50; 9:33. Moreover, the interpolation into Matthew is much more improbable than its omission in Mark and Luke. Both narrate the change of Simon's name (Mark 3:16; Luke 6:14), but they do not give an explanation, either because they suppose it is known or because, since it has to do with something very praiseworthy in Peter, it could be omitted by St. Mark, who reflects the preaching of St. Peter in his Gospel; and St. Luke can depend on St. Mark.¹⁶ Finally, St. Matthew, since he wrote his Gospel *for the Jews*, had to present the words with which Christ instituted the Church in order *to take the place of the Synagogue*; but Mark and Luke did not have to do that for their readers.

Recently Graber confirmed with positive arguments the explanation which holds that Matthew had no difficulty in narrating the promise of the Primacy, since he wrote before the persecution of the Apostles began. But Mark wrote after Peter in the year 43 had been put in prison by king Agrippa and then was freed by an angel; he was also writing for the Romans who, if they read about the promise *of the keys of the kingdom* and the power *of binding and loosing* made to Peter, without doubt would have opposed him; therefore for prudential reasons it was necessary to remain silent about this point, lest the authorities of the State be stirred up against the Church. And Luke also had to remain silent about this for the same reasons and because in this he was dependent on Mark.¹⁷

181. 2) *The historical genuineness* of Matt. 16:16-19 is vindicated (D 3567).

The theory of idealization or of form-criticism (Formgeschichte), concedes indeed that the text was written by St. Matthew, but says that in it is exhibited, not the mind of Christ nor his words, but rather what Matthew and the early Church thought about Peter and his relation to the Church (Gemeindetheologie). The presuppositions of this theory and the nature of its explanation are described in the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" (D 3494-3498).¹⁸

16. See below n.235; Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* I (1950) p.216; Simón-Dorado, *Nov. Test.* I (1947) n.75.77.94; Lagrange, *Evang. Selon S. Marc* introd. PCXII.

17. R. Graber, *Petrus der Fels* (1949) 16-36.

18. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.347-349, 358-361; J. Huby, *L'Evangile* (1954) 89-93.

A) *In general*, this theory says, beginning from the death of Christ up to the conversion of St. Paul, so within five to seven years, in the church in Jerusalem which was immersed in eschatological ideas, that the Apostles and the disciples of Christ and their followers, in virtue of the evolution of their religious affections, which derived those religious ideas from outside and by transforming them made them their own, put together the teaching of Christ and what is contained in the Gospels about Christ, and enhanced the simple historical facts of the life of Jesus with innumerable imaginary myths (Loisy, Bultmann, Kümmel).¹⁹

182. B) *In particular*, among other fictions Matt. 16:16-19 is cited, where the particular primacy is attributed to Peter. The basis of this fiction is found in the fact that Peter was the first one to see the risen Christ (1 Cor. 15:5; Luke 24:34) and the first preacher of his resurrection (Acts 2:14-36; 3:12-26; 4:8-12; 5:29-32). Then, other notes deforming and transforming the image of Peter were added, derived from Jewish literature according to Goetz, or from the popular images of other religions according to Dell, or from the circumstances of the Palestinian geography according to Hart and Immisch, or from the images with which the Jews were describing the eschatological Kingdom according to Bultmann.²⁰

183. Against these theories of idealization *the historical genuineness of Matt. 16:16-19 is to be held*. For, having supposed the literary genuineness of the text, it is necessary to defend the historical genuineness of an author who is upright, truthful and worthy of belief, unless the contrary is proved with certainty. But the theories of idealization do not in any way prove the contrary. Therefore the historical genuineness of Matt. 16:16-19 is to be held. *The major* is evident.

184. Therefore, *the minor* is proved. A) *In general, the theory of idealization is absurd*:

1) Because it is aprioristic and based on an erroneous prejudice: for, it supposes a priori that everything supernatural is impossible, and with a prejudiced opinion it denies the divine mission and authority of Christ.

19. A. Loisy, *Les Evangiles synoptiques* 2 (1908) in Matt. 16:13-19; R. Bultmann, *Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Perus-Bekenntnis*: ZNTWiss 19 (1920) 165-174; Id., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* (1931); Id., *Theol. Des N.T.* (1948) § 6-8; see what we cited in note 5; W.G. Kümmel, *Jesus und die Anfänge der Kirche*: StudTheol 7 (1953) 1-27.

20. K.G. Goetz, *Petrus als Gründer und Oberhaupt der Kirche* (1927); Dell, *Matthäus* 16,17-19: ZNTWiss 15 (1914) 1-49; 17 (1916) 27-32; J.H.A. Hart, *Cephas and Christ*: JThSt 9 (1908) 14-41; O. Immisch, *Matthäus* 16,18: ZNTWiss 17 (1916) 18-26; R. Bultmann, *Theol. Des N.T.* (1948) § 6-8; Id., *Weissagung und Erfüllung*: StudTheol 2 (1949) 21-44.

2) Because it contradicts the essential character of the Gospels and the early Church, which is so history-conscious and traditional that it wishes to admit nothing except what has been handed on by eyewitnesses. If this evident historical character of the Gospels and the early Church is denied, then a fortiori one must doubt all historical certitude.

3) Because it is impossible, for without a miracle it could not happen that in such a short space of time, such sublime doctrines, by uneducated men, in the face of so many immediate and severe tests, without any sign of contradiction, could be invented and imposed.

185. B) In particular, the fabrication of Matt. 16:16-19 is impossible:

1) Because of its importance; for, in this context we are dealing with the messiahship and divinity of Christ, with the foundation and origin of the Church, with the Primacy of Peter the Apostle—with a fact finally to which all the Apostles were eyewitnesses; who could believe that such a great fabrication was able to prevail, while Peter, the other Apostles and all the disciples remained silent and gave their consent?

2) Because of its origin and purpose; for, in the hypothesis of the authors of the theory of idealization, this fabrication had its origin in a democratic church opposed to universalism, as they describe the Jerusalem Church, and the purpose of the fabrication is to extol Peter above the other Apostles as the monarchical head and foundation of a universal Church.

3) Because the reasons on which it is based have been found by contemporary critics to be without value.²¹ Indeed the arguments of the theory of *idealization* can be turned back on its promoters to destroy its foundation, which is a *purely eschatological Kingdom*.

For, the theory asserts: a) that Christ could not have spoken about the Church except after the Church already existed; therefore it concludes: that Christ could not have promised that he would build a Church. If the supposition were true, I argue in the same way—that Christ could not speak about a merely eschatological Kingdom except after such a Kingdom already existed; therefore I conclude: that Christ could not have preached a merely eschatological Kingdom.

The same theory asserts: b) that Matthew did not report the mind and words of Christ about Peter and the Church, but the mind and words of the Evangelist himself and of the Church that erroneously believed they were

21. The reasons on which the theory of idealization is based, in order to deny the historical genuineness of Matt. 16:17-19, have been found to be groundless by K.L. Schmidt, *Die Kirche des Urchristentums* (1927) 201; Id., *Ἐκκλησία* in *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* 3,226ff.; O. Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche* (1932) 180ss. See F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 87ff.; A. Oepke, *Der Herrnspruch über die Kirche*: *StudTheol* 2 (1950) 110-165; O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* p.143-191.

the mind and words of Christ himself. Against the same supposition I argue similarly: that Matthew did not report the mind and words of Christ about a merely eschatological Kingdom, but the mind and words of the Evangelist himself and of the Church that erroneously believed they were the mind and words of Christ himself. Therefore, its principles and suppositions can be turned back against the theory itself.

186. 3. The true interpretation of the words of the Lord, by which *now the promise of the Primacy from Matt. 16:13-19* is to be proved.²²

Proof. In Matt. 16:13-19 Christ promises *immediately* to St. Peter an extraordinary prerogative over the whole Church included in three metaphors. But under these three metaphors Christ *directly* signified supreme social power. Therefore, Christ promised St. Peter immediately and directly supreme social power over the whole Church.

187. The major. A prerogative is promised:

a) *Extraordinary*: Because it is shown as corresponding to the faith of Peter which is praised as extraordinary; because it is said to be the root of indefectibility; because its effects touch heaven; and because he is distinguished by the change of his name "Simon," which happens three times in Scripture: a) to Abraham (Gen. 17:5), when as a reward for his fidelity he is constituted the father of the people of God *before the Law*; 2) to Jacob (Gen. 32:28; 35:9) when as a reward for his fortitude he is named "Israel" and becomes the father of the people of God, a rebellious people *under the Law*; 3) to Peter (Matt. 16:18), since as a reward for his faith he is constituted as the leader of the people of God *under grace*. Christ already at that time announced the change of this name, when for the first time he saw Peter and spoke to him, saying: *So you are Simon, the son of John? You shall be called Cephas (which means Peter)* (John 1:42).

188. b) Over the whole Church. Because it is *over the Church* without restriction, and at the time of Christ the word "Church" had a universal meaning, which is the primary meaning of the word (see n.145 and 150 note 19). Because *over my Church*, that is, of him who from the revelation of the Father is recognized by Peter as the Messiah and the true Son of God;

22. See A. Medebielle, *Eglise*: DBS 545,585. For the individual words of the text, see F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti Lexicon graecum*; H.L. Strack-Billerbeck, *Das Evang. nach Matthaeus 16,16-19*; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante* (1927) 93-113; H. Bruders, *Mt 16,19; 18,18; Io 20,22.23 in frühchristliche Auslegung*: ZkathTh 34 (1910) 559ff.; 35 (1911) 790ff.464ff.690ff. Leo XIII "Satis cognitum" explains Matt. 16:17-19 (ASS 28,725ff.); J. Jeremias, Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 3,749ff.; R. Baumann, *Des Petrus Bekenntnis und Schlüssel* (1950); Y. Congar, *Esquisses du Mystère de l'Eglise* (1953) 123-127.

therefore over the Church that is just as universal as the *Kahal of Yahweh*. Because over the Church to which he committed the *keys of the universal Kingdom of heaven*, or which he bound all to enter under the threat of their salvation, which has already been proved (see n.47-51, 132-137).

c) *Immediately to Peter*; because the promise is made to the *person* of Peter, with no one in between, as is clear from the use of names and the personal pronouns, and from the contrapositions, which show the immediacy:

“they (the Apostles) said—*Simon responded*”;

“Peter said: *you are the Christ—I say to you, because you are Peter*”;

“Blessed are you *Simon Bar Jonah*—because *my Father* had revealed to you”;

“*You are Kepha* and on this *Kepha—I will build my Church*.”

The play on words manifests the Semitic origin of the text, where the same word *Kepha* repeated twice in the same form clearly shows that the foundation of the Church, which is being built, is the person himself of Simon to whom the words are directed. This play on words disappears in the Greek and Latin translations.

189. The minor: The supreme social power is signified directly by the three metaphors:

A) Under the metaphor of the *rock* (petra) it means that Peter is related to the Church as the natural foundation is related to a house, that is, the first efficacious principle of its unity and durability. But the first efficacious principle of unity and durability in a society is its supreme authority. Therefore, under the metaphor of the Rock (Peter) the supreme social power is signified.

The *major* is true because it expresses the way of thinking of Christ himself as portrayed in the books of the New Testament.²³ For

190. 1) The Church is like a *house* which is *built*, as is clear from the word used, not δομέω (I build), but οἰκοδομέω (I build a house) (Matt. 16:18); and so St. Paul calls the Church “the house of God” (1 Tim. 3:15).

2) The Rock is like a natural foundation, on which an artificial foundation is built (θεμέλιον), for the construction of a house, as is clear from Luke 6:48. (Check the original Greek text.).

3) The fundamental rock is the principle of the durability of the whole house and of the unity of its parts, as is certain from Matt. 7:24.

The *minor* is per se evident from the nature of the matter. Therefore the

23. See Murray, *De Ecclesia*, d.6 s.2 n.1; Billot, *De Ecclesia* q.13 § 1.

conclusion is true.

191. B) Under the metaphor of *the Keys* it is said that power is promised to Peter with regard to *the Kingdom of Heaven*, which is given to him by the handing over of the keys. But by the handing over of the keys supreme authority is given in the matter to which the keys pertain. Therefore under the metaphor of the Keys the supreme power is signified.

The major. By *the Keys of Heaven* the power is meant which in heaven was attributed to the divinities, like Schamasch in Babylonia, Dikae in Greece, Janus in Italy, Mithras in the cult of the Mysteries of the Sun, etc.²⁴

The minor. By the handing over of the *Keys* supreme authority is conferred:

1) *In common secular use*, by the handing over of the Keys of a city, of a kingdom, etc., supreme authority over that city, kingdom, etc., is transferred. Thus, Suleiman, the king of the Turks, said to the legates of the emperor Ferdinand I: "I will carry the Keys of Hungary on my shoulder," that is, I will take Hungary. A picture expresses the same thing—one in which Velázquez painted the capture of the city of Breda in the year 1626, where the conqueror Ambrose de Spinola, as a sign of power, accepts the keys of the city from the Dutch leader, Justin of Nasau.

2) *In the use of the Greeks and Romans*, among whom the priests are called κλειδοῦχοι or *key-carriers* and have power over the temples; in fact, the Egyptian, Greek and Roman divinities are represented holding in their hands keys as a sign of the powers, which are attributed to them, over the earth and the sea, or over cities, or over the whole universe, or over hell itself.²⁵

3) *In the use of the Jews* in the extra-canonical literature, where the Prince of the angels, Michael, is called ὁ κλειδοῦχος τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, and God himself is described as "holding in his hand the keys of the places where the souls dwell."²⁶

192. 4) *In the biblical use of the O.T.* In Isa. 9:6f. it is said about the Messiah: *the government will be upon his shoulder;... of the increase of his government there will be no end;... upon the throne of David and over his kingdom he will sit.* Here "on the shoulder of the Messiah" is meant to be a sign of his supreme authority in the Davidic kingdom. Actually among the Semites, the *key*, because of its large size, was carried on the shoulder and was a sign of power; and so in Rev. 3:7 it is said about the Messiah, *who has the key of David.* Therefore in the O.T. the supreme power of the Messiah is signified by the symbol of the key.

24. See J. Jeremias in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* 3,743.

25. See R. Vallois in Daremberg-Saglio, *Dict. des antiquités grec. Et rom.* 4,1247f.; Kohl in Paulys-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopaedie der klass. Altertums*, 11,593-600.

26. J. Jeremias and Strack-Billerbeck, in the places cited in note 22.

Furthermore, in Isa. 22:20ff. God announces with these words that he will give Eliakim full power in the kingdom of David: *I will commit your authority to his hand; and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David; and he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.* Therefore in the O.T. power in the kingdom of David is signified by the symbol of the key, and it is supreme because it is said to be irrevocable.²⁷

5) *In the biblical use of the N.T.* Christ certainly obtains the complete power of the Davidic kingdom, according to the famous annunciation which the angel made (Luke 1:32f.). No other symbol of this authority is given except that of the key: *The words of the holy one, the true one, who has the key of David, who opens and no one shall shut, who shuts and no one opens* (Rev. 3:7). By the same symbol of the keys the supreme authority is designated, which Christ obtained by his resurrection over death and over Hades, according to the words: *I am the first and the last, and the living one; I died, and behold I am alive for evermore, and I have the keys of Death and Hades* (Rev. 1:17f.).

Moreover, in some sense the scribes held *the key of the Kingdom of Heaven*, but because they made bad use of it, therefore Christ rejected them, saying: *Woe to you, lawyers, for you have taken away the key of knowledge... and you shut (κλείετε) the kingdom of heaven against men; for you neither enter yourselves, nor allow those who would enter to go in* (Luke 11:52; Matt. 23:13).²⁸

Therefore this supreme authority of the Kingdom of Heaven, the keys of which are its symbol and which belong to Christ, is promised to Peter in Matt. 16:19, and is signified by the symbol of the handing over of the *keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*.

193. C) Supreme authority is signified by the metaphor of *binding-loosing*.²⁹

N.B. 1) The twofold power of binding-loosing among the Semites can signify: a) either the authority of forbidding-permitting, b) or the power of declaring something forbidden or permitted, as we explained in the preceding thesis, n.134ff.

2) This twofold power in Matt. 16:19 is very ample, because it is extended to "whatever," and it is the highest and fullest in its own area;

27. J. Knabenbauer-F.Zorell, *Comment. In Is 9,6f.; 22,20f.*

28. K. Adam, *Gesammelte Aufsätze* (1936) p.31ff.

29. K. Adam, *ibid.*, *Sprachgebrauch von Binden und Lösen* p.17-52.

because it is considered as ratified in heaven, no one can appeal from it to some other power, which is superior to it on earth.

194. Proof. Under the metaphor of binding-loosing the power is signified whether of forbidding-permitting, or of declaring forbidden-permitted whatever, with the power of absolutely binding. But this is supreme social power. Therefore, under the metaphor of binding-loosing the supreme social power in the Church is signified, which is conferred on St. Peter. (See above, n.135f.).

195. D) A synthesis. According to the threefold metaphor,

1) The Church is: a) like the house of God to be built, b) like the kingdom of heaven to be administered, c) like a religion fixing bonds or releasing them in heaven.

2) Peter in it is: a) like the rock or first principle of unity and durability, b) like the key-carrier or Vice-King to whom the care of all is committed, c) like the binder-looser or the all-powerful judge who decides things.

196. 3) Hence I argue: Regarding the Church what will happen in the future is promised to Peter alone: a) the principal foundation of this building or the root of its unity and durability, b) the key-carrier of this kingdom, or the universal overseer, c) the supreme judge of this religion in order to make final decisions. But the principle foundation of a society or the root of its unity and durability, the universal overseer; the supreme judge in deciding is the supreme power of the same society. Therefore under the threefold metaphor supreme authority in the Church is promised to Peter alone.

Thus the argument from the threefold metaphor conjointly appears to be a certain demonstration.

197. Scholium. A proof of the Primacy from Luke 22:32. With the text of St. Matthew, from which we prove the promise of the Primacy, another text of St. Luke shows a real parallelism, from which rightly it can also be proven that the Primacy in the office of teaching belongs to St. Peter. We will have to treat this text when we consider the infallibility of the Primacy of the Church. Therefore, let it suffice here to point out a few things as follows:

Matt. 16:18: *And I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock that your faith may not fail; and when I will build my Church, you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.*
 Luke 22:32: *But I have prayed for you, that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.*

198. From this real parallelism it is clearly apparent that in both texts a firmness

for Peter is derived from Christ, upon which the Church firmly stands. The difference consists in the fact that the text of St. Luke speaks in particular about firmness in faith, while the text of St. Matthew exhibits no such restriction; but in both cases equally the office of foundation is attributed to Peter. But in Matt. 16:18 supreme power related to the Church in general is promised to St. Peter. Therefore in Luke 22:32 to the same St. Peter is promised the supreme power in particular regarding the faith of the Church.³⁰

199. Objections.³¹ I. Christ promised supreme authority to all the Apostles.

1. Matt. 16:15-17: To Christ's question to the Apostles, Peter answered for them; therefore Christ's promise is given to Peter, but it is meant for all the Apostles.

I distinguish the antecedent. Peter answers according to his own faith, while the others remain silent, *conceded*; he answers according to the faith of the Apostles and in their name, *denied*. The *consequent* is distinguished in the same way and the *consequence* is denied.

2. But Peter answers according to the faith of the Apostles and hence in their name. Matt. 14:33: the Apostles had already shown the same faith in Christ's divinity. Therefore he responds according to the faith and in the name of the Apostles.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Apostles had already shown the same faith based on Christ's miracles, *conceded*; based on a singular revelation, *denied*.

I distinguish the consequent in the same way. Peter responds according to the faith of the Apostles, but based on a further singular revelation, *conceded*; based only on Christ's miracles, *denied*.

200. 3. But the promise of the Primacy was not made to Peter alone. Therefore, *the difficulty remains*. Matt. 18:1: the Apostles afterwards disputed, asking which one of them was greater. But they would not have disputed if the promise of the Primacy had been made to Peter alone. Therefore the promise of the Primacy was not made to Peter alone.

I distinguish the major. The Apostles disputed either because they did not understand the promise or because they ignored the Primacy, *conceded*; they disputed because the promise had not been made to Peter, *denied*. The *minor* is distinguished; the *consequent* and the *consequence* are denied. It is certain from Matt. 20:21 that the Apostles ignored the Primacy.

4. But the same promise was made to all the Apostles. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. Matt. 18:18: Christ promises supreme power to all the Apostles. Therefore the same promise was made to all the Apostles.

I distinguish the antecedent. To the Apostles as a college with Peter and under Peter, *conceded*; in the same way as to Peter, *denied*.

201. 5. But all the Apostles are equal in power to Peter. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. Eph. 2:20: The Apostles together with Peter are the foundation of the Church.

30. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.183; O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) p.164ff. See Pius XII, *Allocut. Quaest'ora*":AAS 46 (1954) 309.

31. See H. van Laak, *Institut. Theol. Fundam.* 4 *De Ecclesia* l.1 n.6-18.80-88; J.V. de Groot, *Summa apolog.de Ecclesia* q.14 a.1 p.503ff.

Therefore all the Apostles are equal in power to Peter.

I distinguish the antecedent. By reason of the Apostolate or as the first builders (θεμέλιοι) of the Church after Christ, *conceded*; by reason of the Primacy or in the place of Christ as the natural foundation (πέτρα) of the Church, *denied*.

I also distinguish the consequent. By reason of the Apostolate, *conceded*; by reason of the Primacy, *denied*.

202. 6. But the Apostolate in the Church is the highest grade of power. Therefore *the difficulty remains*.

Eph. 4:11: The Apostolate is thought to be above the other grades of power. Therefore the Apostolate in the Church is the highest grade of power.

I distinguish the antecedent. Positively above those that are cited, *conceded*; exclusively or excluding every other grade, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Of the grades that are cited, *conceded*; of all grades absolutely, *denied*.

7. But the Apostolate is the highest grade of power exclusively and absolutely. Therefore *the difficulty remains*.

1 Cor. 12:28: It is expressly stated that the *first* grade of power is the Apostolate. Therefore it is also supreme and absolute.

I distinguish the antecedent. Among the charismatic grades that are mentioned, *conceded*; among the grades of hierarchic power, *I subdistinguish*: as a College with the Primacy and under the Primacy of Peter, *conceded*; excluding the Primacy of Peter, *denied*.

203. II. The promise of the Primacy cannot be directed immediately to the person of Peter.

8. Matt. 16:17 and 23: If the praise of Christ and hence the promise were directed immediately to Peter, Christ at the same time would be calling him "blessed" and "Satan." But this is repugnant. Therefore the promise is not directed immediately to the person of Peter.

I distinguish the major. Under a different respect, *conceded*; under the same respect, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way and deny the consequent*.

9. But the promise cannot be directed to the person of Peter. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. S.Th. II-II, q. 174, a. 6 and the *Catena* on Matt. 16:18: The promise must be understood to be about the faith which Peter confessed. Therefore it cannot be directed to the person of Peter.

I distinguish the antecedent. It must be understood to be about the faith of Peter, as about the occasion of the promise freely given, or as about the dispositive form of the subject to whom the promise is directed, *conceded*; it must be understood about the simple faith of Peter as about the subject to whom the promise is made directly and immediately, *denied*.

204. 10. But the promise cannot be understood as directed to Peter. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. St. Augustine (*Retract.* 1,21,1): It should be understood to be about Christ. Therefore it cannot be understood to be about Peter.

I distinguish the antecedent. Literally “you are Kepha and upon this Kepha” can be understood to be about Christ, *denied*; theologically it can be understood about Christ, *I subdistinguish*: as about the really proper and principal foundation of the Church, not having excluded Peter, *conceded*; having excluded Peter as the secondary and really vicarious foundation, *denied*.

11. But it should be understood about Christ alone. Therefore, *the difficulty remains*.

John 2:19: “This temple” must be understood about the body alone of Christ; in the same way, “upon this rock” must be understood about the person alone of Christ.

I deny the parity. The disparity is certain, because in the context “this temple” can be understood about the body of Christ and it is expressly said (2:21) that it must be understood to be about his body; but “upon this rock” literally cannot be understood about the person of Christ, for it is said, *you are the rock* and upon this *rock*, and in no way does it signify that it must be understood about the person of Christ.

205. 12. But it absolutely must be understood about the person of Christ. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. 1 Cor. 3:11: There is no other foundation of the Church except Christ. Therefore....

I distinguish the antecedent. The foundation placed by the Apostles (θεμέλιον) is nothing other than the doctrine of Christ and about Christ, *conceded*; the foundation place by Christ (πέτρα) is nothing other than Christ, *denied*.

13. But the foundation placed by Christ is nothing other than Christ. Therefore *the difficulty remains*.

Eph. 2:20: *You Gentiles... you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone of the Church, and therefore he is its only foundation. I distinguish the consequent.* Christ is like the cornerstone of a building in order to support and unite the two walls of Gentiles and Jews who until now were divided, *conceded*. Therefore Christ is the only foundation of the Church, *I subdistinguish*: primary and on his own right, *conceded*; excluding a secondary and vicarious foundation, *denied*.

206. 14. But the natural foundation (πέτρα) for every reason is only Christ. Therefore *the difficulty remains*.

1 Cor. 10:4: *And the rock was Christ.* Therefore....

I distinguish the antecedent. Christ is called the rock inasmuch as he was the fountain of graces, which before his coming were given because of the faith and hope in the Christ who was going to come, *conceded*; inasmuch as he was the natural foundation in such a way that he excluded every other aspect of the founding, *denied*.

207. 15. Since Simon was weak in his character he could not be compared by Christ to a rock. Therefore the words of Matt. 16:18 were not spoken by Jesus.

I distinguish the antecedent. Simon could not be compared to a rock by reason of his psychological character, *conceded*; by reason of the virtue and power Christ in-

tended to confer on him, *denied*.

16. If the words of Matt. 16:17-19 were spoken by Christ, Peter would have had authority over the Apostles and over Paul, which the sources tell us Peter de facto did not have. Therefore the words of Matt. 16:17-19 are not those of Christ.

I distinguish the antecedent. The sources say that Peter de facto did not obtain authority over the Apostles by reason of the Apostolate alone, *conceded*: by reason of the Primacy, *denied*. For, in the Gospels, in the Acts of the Apostles and in the letter of St. Paul to the Galatians so many and such singular prerogatives are acknowledged as belonging to Peter that their convergence cannot be explained unless the Primacy of St. Peter is admitted.³²

32. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* th.14. See below nn.270-276.

ARTICLE II

CHRIST CONFERRED THE PRIMACY ON ST. PETER

Thesis 5. After his resurrection from the dead Christ the Lord conferred the Primacy of jurisdiction over the universal Church directly and immediately on St. Peter.

208. See the authors referenced in the preceding thesis. Also S.Th., *In Io* 21:5-28; St. Bellarmine, *Controv.* 3.1.1 c.14-28; A. Straub, th.5f.; D. Palmieri, th.3-6; M. D'Herbigny, th.16; H. Dieckmann, th.14 .372; A. Medebielle, *In Io* 21; *Eglise*: DBS 590-596; N. Cavatassi, *De munere "Pastoris" in N.T.*: VerbDom 29 (1951) 215-227, 275-285. DTC 13,259-262.

209. **Connection.** After the thesis on the promise of the Primacy, following the order of doctrine used by Vatican Council I (see D 3053-3054), we will now demonstrate in particular the conferral of the same Primacy.

210. **The terms** necessary for this thesis and also the *opinions* contrary to it are the same as those already explained in that thesis, n.163-166, with the exception of those that are referred to the text itself of Matt. 16:16-19.

211. **The doctrine of the Church and the theological note.** *The thesis is defined divine faith* in Vatican Council I (D 3053f.), where it was expressly defined that the conferral of the Primacy to St. Peter was made by the Lord with the words in John 21:15-17. See also the Encyclical of Pius XI "*Quod nunquam*" (D 1842 [34th ed.]).

Leo XIII in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" gives a further explanation of the ext of John 21:15-17, when he says: "The promise is carried out when Christ the Lord after his resurrection, having asked Peter three times whether he loved him more than the rest, lay on him the injunction: *Feed my lambs—feed my sheep*. That is, he confides to him, without exception, all those who were to belong to his fold... These, then, are the duties of a shepherd: to place himself as leader at the head of his flock, to provide food for it, to ward off dangers, to guard against insidious foes, to defend it against violence: in a word, to rule and govern it. Since therefore Peter has been placed as Shepherd of the Christian flock, he has received the power of governing all men for whose salvation Jesus Christ shed his blood."

Pius XII similarly in his Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*" teaches: "It is a well-known fact that when Christ our Lord, after having himself throughout this mortal pilgrimage visibly governed the 'little flock,' was about to leave this world and return to the Father, he entrusted to the Prince of the Apostles the visible government of the whole society which he had founded. Such was his wisdom that he could in no wise leave the social

body of his Church without a visible head."¹

212. Proof. 1) As the conclusion of the previous thesis it is proved in general that Christ *at some time* conferred the Primacy on Peter.²

For, from the treatise *On the divine Legate* we know that Christ is the Legate of God and the true Son of God. Indeed in the preceding thesis we have proved that Christ promised Peter the Primacy, and it was an absolute promise with no conditions attached to it, as is clear from the words of the promise (Matt. 16:18f.). But a promise from the divine Legate and from the Son of God himself with no conditions attached at some time must certainly be fulfilled. Therefore Christ *at some time* certainly conferred the Primacy on Peter.

The minor is certain, because the divine Legate *speaks the words of God* (John 3:34); and the true Son of God is absolutely *Faithful and Truthful* (Rev. 19:11). But the word of God absolutely affirmed by the Son of God, who is absolutely Faithful and Truthful, must at some time certainly be fulfilled. Therefore, the promise of the Primacy by the divine Legate and by the Son of God himself absolutely and without any condition given to Peter must *at some time* certainly be fulfilled.

213. Proof. 2) *From the words of John 21:15-17.*

It should be noted concerning the text of John 21:1-25. a) In the Gospel of St. John there are two conclusions: one is at 20:30f., but the other is at the end of chapter 21:24f. Hence some non-Catholics have said that all of chapter 21 was not written by St. John, but that it was added shortly after his death by his disciples.

b) But this chapter 21 is present in all the codices and translations and in its essentials it agrees with the other chapters of the Gospel of St. John, and by all the Fathers it has always been acknowledged as a genuine chapter of the same Gospel. Therefore most of the critics think that there is no good reason to doubt its genuineness

c) But it can be conceded in agreement with many critics that this chapter 21 is something like an appendix written by the same St. John, as the nature of the style proves, added later, whether to hand on the account of the conferral of the Primacy, as Toledo thinks, or to correct the false opinion of others concerning the immortality of John himself, as Patritius thinks (John 21:23). The differences of style, which Boismard pointed out recently, seem to us to be accidental and of little importance.³

214. d) Lagrange thinks that the disciples of John added only the last conclusion (John 21:24f.), and that the same disciples at the end of the preceding chapter trans-

1. Leo XIII: ASS 28,727f.; Pius XII: AAS 35,210.

2. See A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.154; J. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.46.

3. F. Toledo, *In S.Ioan. Evangelium* 21,1; F.X. Patriti, *Comment. In Io 21,1*. See E.B. Allo, *Saint Jean, L'Apocalypse* 1,20 (1933)27f.; E. Boismard, O.P., *Le chapitre 21 de S.Jean*: RevBibl 54 (1947) 473-501 tried to show that the style is not John's, but rather that of Clement of Rome. But later he acknowledged the dependence of Clement on John; Id., *Clément de Rome et l'Evangile de Jean*: RevBibl 55 (1948) 376-387.

ferred the other conclusion (John 20:30f.), which St. John had written at the end of his Gospel after John 21:23. But this hypothesis, since it has no foundation in the tradition of the text, seemingly should not be admitted.⁴

Therefore, from the critical point of view it is certain that chapter 21 either was written by St. John himself or at least always was recognized as a part of his Gospel from the very beginning. However, only the last verse of the Gospel (John 21:25) can in some sense be called into doubt, because the approval of tradition for it is not unanimous.

e) R. Graber recently has no doubts about the genuineness of chapter 21, and he shows very well that it was written especially in order to narrate the historical fact of the conferral of the Primacy. F. Segarra holds strongly for the genuineness, and he acknowledges the purpose of narrating the tradition of the Primacy. Concerning the concrete occasion, which each of these authors finds and proposes, which induced the hagiographer to add this chapter, in our opinion it is only a hypothesis which does not seem to be confirmed by positive arguments.⁵

215. Chapter 21 of St. John's Gospel, in what concerns us here, can be divided into four parts: 1) John 21:1-8, shows the preparation of the minds of the Apostles by the miracle of the fish; because of it Peter remembers the other similar experience of fishing after which Jesus called Peter to become a permanent follower (Luke 5:1-10).

2) John 21:9-14, shows the way in which Christ prepared the hearts of the Apostles by the signs of love manifested in the meal prepared for them by him; in this way he certainly revealed himself to them as the good Master.

3) John 21:15-17, narrates the very words with which the "Good Shepherd," Christ, conferred on Peter the Apostle the care of feeding his whole flock. Note the modesty with which Peter answers, in contrast with the arrogance he showed before he denied Christ (Matt. 26:31-35).

4) John 21:18f., refers to the prophecy in which the Lord tells Peter the martyrdom he will suffer in imitation of the Good Shepherd, who *lays down his life for his sheep* (John 10:11).

216. It is clear to anyone comparing the text of John 21:15-17 with that of Matt. 16:15-19 that Christ the Lord promised the Primacy to Peter after his profession of faith, and to the same one showing his love he conferred the same Primacy, "so that he might teach us whom he left as his Vicar after his ascent into heaven."⁶

4. M. Lagrange, *Evangelie selon St. Jean* (1927) 519-534.

5. F. Segarra, *La doble conclusion del Evangelio de S. Juan*: EstEcl 9 (1930) 32-47; R. Graber, *Petrus der Fels* (1950) 37-48. See K. Horn, *Abfassungszeit, Geschichtlichkeit und Zweck von Evang. Joh. Kap. 21* (1904).

6. St. Ambrose, *In Lucam* 1.10 n.175: ML 15,1848.

217. Proof. After his resurrection Christ immediately conferred on St. Peter the care of feeding his flock, in John 21:15-17. But to feed the flock of Christ directly signifies to govern the faithful of Christ united together in the Church with social and supreme power. Therefore after his resurrection from the dead Christ directly and immediately conferred on St. Peter supreme power over the whole Church.

218. The major. We are saying 1) He conferred it on St. Peter immediately, because Christ directs the words to the person of Peter, and what is signified by the words is conferred on Peter himself as its proper subject with no one else in between; this is clear from the words used: *Simon Peter, Simon, son of John* (three times), *do you love me more than these?*—*I love you* (three times, with which doubtless there is an allusion to the three personal denials of Peter), *feed* (three times), *I say to you, you girded yourself, another will gird you and carry you where you do not wish to go.* Therefore the names and personal pronouns are multiplied; moreover, very personal allusions are made, all of which evidently signify a certain immediacy between Christ and Peter. The allusion to the three denials is very personal.

St. Augustine says: "For why does he question the lover three times, unless it is to remind him of his three denials?" And elsewhere: "The triple confession replaces the triple denial, so that the conversation would manifest more love than fear. Let it be an office of love to feed the Lord's flock, if it was a sign of fear to deny the Shepherd." The threefold repetition also signifies the solemnity of the conferral of the right.⁷

219. 2) We are saying: The care of feeding his flock, because the Lord expressly commands: *Feed my lambs, feed my sheep* βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατα μου. St. Thomas says, "Feed my lambs, that is, my faithful called lambs by me the Lamb (John 1:29): so that he cannot be said to be a Christian, who says that he is not under the care of this shepherd, namely Peter."⁸

220. The minor. We are saying 1) That the *flock of Christ* directly signifies Christ's faithful; we are certain of this from the explanation of the Lord in the parable of the Good Shepherd, where the sheep of Jesus are said to be: a) those who acknowledge and follow Christ and also believe in him: *I am the good shepherd, and I know my own and my own know me... you do not believe, because you do not belong to my sheep. My sheep hear*

7. St. Augustine, *Serm.* 285 n.3: ML 38,1295; *In Io* tr.123 c.21 n.5: ML 35,1967; *Serm.* 53 n.1: ML 38,1179. The formula repeated three times in John 21:15-17 signifies the solemnity which Christ intended in the act of constituting Peter as his Vicar. For, the formula three times repeated before witnesses was widely diffused throughout the whole Orient, and it is used to solemnly confer orally some right made permanent with absolute value: P. Gaechter, *Das dreifache "Pasce oves meas"*: ZkathTh 69 (1947) 328-344.

8. S.Th., *In Io* 21,16.

my voice, and I know them, and they follow me (John 10:14.26f.); b) those whom Christ came to save forever by his death: *I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly... and I lay down my life for the sheep... and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish* (John 10:9f.15.28).

2) We are saying it signifies the faithful *united together in the Church*:

a) because they are said to constitute one sheepfold that is closed: *He who does not enter the sheepfold by the door but climbs in by another way, that man is a thief and a robber; but he who enters by the door is the shepherd of the sheep... And I have other sheep that are not of this fold; I must bring them also, and they will heed my voice... So there shall be one flock (ποιμνη), one shepherd* (John 10:1f.16); b) because the faithful are said by the Apostles to constitute the flock of Christ, and this flock is called the Church. *So I exhort the elders among you, as a fellow elder...: Tend the flock of God that is in your charge... And when the chief Shepherd (ἀρχιποιμήν) is manifested you will obtain the unfading crown of glory* (1 Pet. 5:1-4); *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed (ποιμαίνειν) the church of the Lord which he obtained with his own blood* (Acts 20:28).

221. 3) We are saying that *to feed* means the same thing as *to govern* with social power, and in the Church this is a threefold power, as has already been proved: to teach, to rule and to sanctify the faithful. And surely this threefold power is sufficiently indicated in the parable of the Good Shepherd: a) *To teach* (John 10:3.16.26f.) “they hear my voice and they believe”; b) *To rule*, whether by leading the sheep (John 10:4f.27), or by defending them (John 10:11-15); *To sanctify* (John 10:9f.28) *I give them eternal life and they shall never perish.*⁹

222. 4) We are saying that to feed is the same as to rule with supreme, and even with royal power.

For in the first place: Without doubt the hearers of Christ understood the images of *feeding* to refer to supreme and royal power: because a) in the Old Testament the image was used in this sense, as in 2 Sam. 5:1-3: *Then all the tribes of Israel came to David at Hebron, and said: Behold, we are your bone and flesh... and the Lord said to you: You shall be shepherd of my people. So all the elders of Israel came to the king at Hebron... and they anointed David king over Israel*; because b) frequently in the books of the O.T. the people of God is called the *flock* and the *sheep* of the Lord, and God himself is said to be the *shepherd* of his people.

In the second place: And especially because with the image of a *flock* the Prophets announced the Messianic Kingdom, and the Messiah King

9. See the commentaries of Fillion, Knabenbauer, Simón-Dorado, on John 10.

with the image of a *shepherd*, as in Jer. 23:1-8, which is explained further in Ezek. 34; for, in this chapter of Ezekiel the word πρόβατα occurs 24 times, ποιμήν 16 times, βόσκω and ποιμαίνω 13 times and they are used as synonyms because they correspond to the same Hebrew word רעה. Indeed in Ezek. 34 the Lord laments in many ways because those established as “shepherds” for them do not properly “feed” “his flock” and “his sheep”: therefore the Lord says, *I will save my flock... I will feed my sheep... I will set up over them one shepherd, my servant David, and he shall feed them and be their shepherd*, Ezek. 34:2-5.9-11.15-16.22-24.29-31.¹⁰ In these places the words “shepherd” and “to feed” clearly signify the supreme power, and indeed the royal power of the Messiah King in the messianic Kingdom.

223. This very point is confirmed by the New Testament. For, in Matt. 2:1-6, the Magi ask: *Where is he who has been born king of the Jews?* But the Jews themselves, namely the Scribes and the chief priests reply: *In Bethlehem... for from you shall come a ruler who will govern my people Israel... and he shall stand and feed (ποιμανεῖ) his flock in the strength of the Lord* (Mic. 5:2-4). Therefore the exercise of messianic power, proper to the King of Israel, was understood as signified by the word “feed.”

224. Now from these words it is necessarily deduced that the social power, which was spoken about in John 21:15-17, can be understood only to be about the supreme and royal power in the messianic Kingdom. That this power is *supreme*, which is given to Peter over the *flock* or the *Kingdom* of Christ, is proved also from the nature of the words with which it is conferred. For a) the power that is conferred is *very singular*, as inculcated by the Lord three times and corresponding to a threefold profession of the greatest love; but such singularity in social power pertains only to *its supreme grade*; and b) the power given to Peter is *universal*, that is, extending itself to all those who can be called the sheep of Christ, therefore it is also extended to the Apostles themselves, who were said by Christ to be his sheep: *Jesus said to them: You will all fall away because of me this night; for it is written, 'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock will be scattered.'* But after I am raised up, I will go before you to Galilee (Matt. 26:31-32). Therefore the office of feeding the sheep of Christ which is committed to Peter is the supreme and royal power of governing over the

10. See above, *On Revelation* nn.629-631 with the Commentaries in the notes given there. Also see L. Denefeld on Jer.23 and on Ezek. 34 in L. Pirot, *La S.Bible* t.7 (1947) 308 and 574. Concerning Ezek. 34:23, note that it was written before 572 before Christ, but that David died about the year 970 before Christ; hence it is clear that the text refers to the Son of David, that is, the Messiah.

flock or Kingdom of Christ.¹¹

225. Scholium. 1. The Primacy of St. Peter is confirmed by the judgment of Christian antiquity.

First of all, it should be noted that the holy Fathers, after the heresy of Arius appeared, paid more attention to the confession of the divinity of Christ than to the foundation of the Church when they explained Matt. 16:15-19. However, in no way did they exclude the literal meaning of the promise of the Primacy made by Christ to Peter at the time, as a reward for the faith professed by Peter.¹²

226. 1) Testimonies of the Latin Fathers:

Tertullian (ca. 200) in *De praescriptione*: "Something was kept secret from Peter about the Church to be built; he was to be called the rock, to acquire the keys of heaven, and the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth" (K 941f.). Again (ca. 220) in *De pudicitia*: after he became a Montanist: "But, you say, the Church has the power of forgiving sins... I now inquire into your opinion, [to see] from what source you usurp this right to the Church. If, because the Lord had said to Peter, 'Upon this rock I will build my church,' 'to you have I given the keys of the heavenly kingdom'; or, 'Whatsoever you shall have bound or loosed on earth, shall be bound or loosed in heaven'; you therefore presume that the power of binding and loosing has derived to you, that is, to every church akin to Peter; what sort of man are you, subverting and wholly changing the manifest intention of the Lord, conferring [as that intention did] this [gift] personally on Peter? "On you," he says, 'I will build my church,' and 'I will give to you the keys,' not to the Church" (R 387).¹³

227. St. Cyprian (ca. 250), *De cath. Eccles. unitate*: "The Lord speaks to Peter: 'I say to you,' he says, 'you are Peter, etc... Upon him, being one, he built his Church... And although after his resurrection he bestows equal power upon all the Apostles (John 21:21-23), still that he might display unity, he established by his authority the origin of the same unity as beginning from one. Surely the rest of the Apostles were also that which Peter was, endowed with an equal partnership of office and of power, but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one. (And the Primacy is given to Peter so that one chair may be shown)" (R 555). "There is one God and one Christ and one Church and one chair founded on Peter by the word of the Lord" (R 573).¹⁴

11. See F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti Lexicon* where you will also find a slight difference of meaning between βόσκω and ποιμαίνω.

12. See I Ottiger, *Theologia fundamentalis* 2 p.145-209.

13. Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* c.22: ML 2,34; see *De monagamia* 8,6: ML 2,939; *De pudicitia* c.21: ML 2,1024.

14. St. Cyprian, *De catholicae Ecclesiae unitate* c.4: ML 4,498; CSEL 3,1,212. See K 266; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* I (1950) 313-343; see Greg 15 (1934) 500; 16 (1935) 196. *Epistolae*, 43,5: ML (Ep.40) 4,336; CSEL 3,2,594.

228. St. Hilary (ca. 360) *In Ps*: "Peter to whom previously he had given the keys of the kingdom of heaven, upon whom he was going to build his Church against which the gates of hell would not prevail, what he bound or loosed on earth would remain in heaven either bound or loosed... he was to suffer so much for the salvation of the human race that he named Peter, the first confessor of the Son of God, the foundation of the Church, the door-keeper of the heavenly kingdom and in earthly affairs the judge of heaven in triumph over Satan."¹⁵

Marius Victorinus (ca. 365) *In Epist. ad Gal*: "If the foundation of the Church was placed in Peter, as is stated in the Gospel; since everything had been revealed to him, Paul knew that he had to see Peter, as the one to whom such authority had been given by Christ, but not in order to learn something from him."¹⁶

229. St. Optatus Milevitanus (ca. 370) *Contra Parmenian*: "You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the episcopal chair was bestowed first on Peter; in it sat Peter, the head of all the Apostles, and so he was called Cephas, and in this one chair unity is preserved for all... Therefore Peter is the first one to sit on that unique chair, which is the first among his gifts" (R 1242). "For the sake of unity blessed Peter... merited to be placed before all the Apostles, and he alone received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which were to be communicated to others... Of course the head of the Apostles could govern himself in such a way that he would not do anything that he would regret: but therefore in his one sin many errors are seen, so it could be shown for the sake of unity that everything must be observed for God."¹⁷

230. Ambrosiaster (ca. 375): "Andrew followed the Savior before Peter: and nevertheless Andrew did not receive the Primacy, but Peter."¹⁸

St. Ambrose (ca. 390) *Expos. Evangel. S. Lucae*: "Peter was sad because he was asked for the third time: 'Do you love me?' For, someone is questioned about what is doubtful, but the Lord did not doubt; he asked not to learn, but in order to teach whom he was leaving as his Vicar for us after his ascension into heaven. Peter bears witness to his affection and therefore because he alone of all of them makes his profession, he is placed before all: for charity is greater than all other things." Also, *Enar. In 12 Ps*: "It is Peter himself to whom he said: 'You are Peter and upon this rock I will build my Church.' Therefore where Peter is, there is the Church; where the Church is, there is no death but eternal life" (R 1261).¹⁹

231. St. Jerome: "The Church is founded on Peter: although in another place it is built on all the Apostles, and all receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and the fortitude of the Church is made firm equally on them, nevertheless among the twelve one is

15. St. Hilary, *In Ps* 131 n.4: ML 9,730; CSEL 22,663.

16. Marius Victorinus, *In epist. ad Gal* 1,18: ML 8,1155.

17. St. Opt. Milevitanus, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 2,2: ML 11,947.1087; CSEL 26,36,171f.

18. Ambrosiaster, *In 2 Cor* 12,11: ML 17,332.

19. St. Ambrose, *Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam* 1,10 n.175: ML 15,1848; *Enarrationes in 12 Psalmos* in Ps 40,30: ML 14,1082.

chosen as the established head, and so the occasion for schism is removed" (R 1379).²⁰

232. St. Augustine (ca. 400) *De baptismo*: "Surely we know about the great merit of Cyprian, bishop and martyr; but is he greater than Peter the Apostle and martyr? The same Cyprian in his letter to Quintus says this about him. For neither Peter, he said, whom the Lord chose first and upon whom he built his Church... Behold where Cyprian mentions, what we also learned in the Holy Scriptures, that the Apostle Peter, in whom the Primacy of the Apostles is preeminent with such excellent grace, apart from the truth demanded to act in the customary way regarding circumcision, was corrected by the Apostle Paul who came later... For who does not know that his Primacy of Apostolate is to be preferred to any other episcopate? But although the grace of chairs is different, nevertheless there is one glory of martyrdom." *Contra Faustum*: "Therefore where is the incongruity if Peter after his sin is made the Shepherd of the Church, just as Moses after killing the Egyptian was made head of the Synagogue?"²¹

233. St. Leo the Great (ca. 450) *Sermon 3*: "The firmness of faith, which is praised in the prince of the Apostles, is perpetual; and just as what Peter believed about Christ is permanent, so also what Christ instituted in Peter is permanent... this can be seen by reading the Gospel (Matt. 16:16-19). Therefore the disposition of truth remains, and blessed Peter persevering in his accepted strength of the rock, did not abandon the accepted governance of the Church. For this he was chosen before the others, so that while he is called the rock, while he is announced as the foundation, while he is constituted door-keeper of the kingdom of heaven, while he is the judge of binding and loosing and the definition of his decisions will also remain in heaven; along with Christ he is in charge of that society and we know him through the mysteries of his various names... That confession obtained this—a confession which was inspired by God the Father in the heart of the Apostle, and it transcends all uncertainties of human opinions, and he received the firmness of the rock, which cannot be shaken by any attacks." *Sermon 4*: "Out of the whole world one Peter is chosen, and he is placed above the call of all the nations and all the Apostles and all the Fathers of the Church; so that although in the people of God there are many priests and many pastors, still Peter rightly governs all of them, and Christ rules them principally. It is something great and admirable, my dear Christians, that the divine dignity conferred on this man a share in his own power; and if he wanted others to have something in common with him, never did he give anything to them that he did not give to him" (R 2191).²²

234. 2) Testimonies of the Oriental Fathers:

Clement of Alexandria (ca. 200). *Which rich man will be saved*: "Therefore on hearing these words, the blessed Peter, the chosen, the pre-eminent, the first of the disciples, for whom alone and himself the Savior paid tribute, quickly seized and compre-

20. St. Jerome, *Adversus Iovinianum* 1,26: ML 23,247.

21. St. Augustine, *De baptismo* 2,1,2: ML 43,126f.; *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 22,70: ML 42,445.

22. St. Leo the Great, *Sermones* 3 c.2f.; 4 c.2L ML 54,145f.149.

hended the saying" (R 436).²³

Origen (ca. 240) *In Exodum*: "See what is said by the Lord to the great foundation of the Church and to the very solid rock upon which Christ built his Church: 'O you of little faith, he said, why do you doubt?'" (R 489). Also, *In Romanos*: "When the supreme power of feeding the sheep was given to Peter, and the Church was founded on him as upon solid ground, the confession of no other virtue was demanded of him except that of charity."²⁴

235. Eusebius Caesariensis (ca. 305) *Hist. Eccles.*: "The benign and merciful providence of God directed Peter, the most courageous and greatest among the Apostles and the first all the others because of the merit of his virtue and the protector in Rome against that stain and plague of the human race" (K 425). Again, *Demonstratio Evangelica*: "Mark, the friend and disciple of Peter, is remembered for his accounts of what Peter said about the deeds of Jesus... Mark was not present at those things which were said by Christ: not even Peter thought that he was equal to the task to relate what was said by Jesus to him and about him. But what those things are which were said to Peter himself Matthew recorded in these words (Matt. 16:15-19). Since so many of these things were said by Jesus to Peter, Mark reported none of them, because not even Peter, as is probable, repeated such things in his sermons... Surely Peter thought that it was best to keep silent about these things: wherefore also Mark omitted them. But what pertains to his denial, he recounted to everyone and publicized it, since after that he wept bitterly (Mark 14:66-72). Mark indeed records these things, and Peter testifies to these things about himself: for all the things that are read in Mark are said to be the narrations and sermons of Peter... If this was proposed by the Evangelists as a fiction, in order to enhance their Teacher with lies... why do they say later that he was sad, and torn with disgust, and disturbed in his mind? or that they deserted him and ran away? or that the one who was over all of them—Peter the Apostle and disciple, having been threatened by neither torments or prison, denied him three times?"²⁵

236. Aphraates (ca. 340): "To Simon the leader of the disciples, when he said in denial: 'I do not know the man'; he did penance and he poured out an abundance of tears; and the Lord took him, and made him the foundation and called him the Rock, for the building of the Church."²⁶

St. Cyril of Jerusalem (ca. 350): "Peter, the chiefest and foremost of the Apostles, denied the Lord thrice before a little maid: but he repented himself, and wept bitterly... and therefore he not only received forgiveness for his denial, but also held the Apostolic dignity unforfeited" (R 810).²⁷

23. Clement of Alexandria, *Quis dives salvetur* 21,3: MG 9,625; GChS 3,173.

24. Origen, *In Exodum* homil.5,4: MG 12,329; *In Romanos* comment. 5,10: MG 14,1035.

25. Eusebius Caesariensis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 2,14,5f.: MG 20,171f.; GChS Eus. 2,138. *Demonstratio evangelica* 3,5: MG 22,216f.220.

26. Aphraates, *Demonstrationes* 7,15: edit. Graffin-Parisot, *Patrologia syriaca* 1,335.

27. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 2,19: MG 33,408.

237. St. Ephraem (ca. 360) *Sermones*: "Simon, my disciple, I made you the foundation of my Church. Previously I called you the rock, because you will support all the buildings; you are the overseer of those who build the Church for me on earth; if they want to build something bad, you as the foundation are to reprimand them; you are the head of the fountain from which my doctrine is drawn, you are the head of my disciples; through you I will provide drink for all the nations; yours in that life-giving sweetness that I give abundantly; I chose you that you may be in my institution like the first-born son and official heir of my treasures; I gave you the keys of my kingdom. Lo, I have set you as the prince over all my treasures" (R 706). Also, in *Matt.* 16:13-28: "You, however, what do you say that I am? Simon, the head and leader, said: 'You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.' And he replied: 'Blessed are you, Simon. And the gates of hell will not overcome you, that is, that your faith will not be destroyed. For, what the Lord builds, who can destroy?... When the Lord built his Church, he built a tower, whose foundations can support everything built on top of it... You are the rock, that rock which he erected, so that Satan would stumble over it. On the contrary, Satan wanted to turn this rock against the Lord, that he might stumble over it, when Peter said to the Lord: "God forbid that this should ever happen to you."'"²⁸

238. St. Epiphanius (ca. 375): "Andrew followed the Lord first... But later a beginning was made by Peter. For then he preceded his brother. God understands who is worthy of the first place. Therefore he made him the leader of his disciples."²⁹

239. St. Basil (ca. 375): "The overseer of such an important judgment, and the minister of such wrath of God against the sinner, that blessed Peter was, the first of all the disciples, to whom alone greater testimonies were given than to the others, who was proclaimed blessed, to whom the keys of the kingdom of heaven were entrusted."³⁰

St. Gregory Nazianzen (ca. 380): "You see how from among the disciples of Christ, all of whom are great and eminent and worthy of being chosen, this one is called the rock, and he accepts the foundations of the Church because of his faith—he is loved dearly and rested on the breast of Christ" (Πέτρα καλεῖται καὶ τοὺς θεμελίους τῆς Ἐκκλησίας πιστεύεται).³¹

St. Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 385): "The memory of Peter is celebrated, who is the head of the Apostles and together with him the other members of the Church are glorified, and the Church of God remains firm. For, according to the prerogative given to him by the Lord, he is the firm and solid rock upon which the Savior founded his Church."³²

28. St. Ephraem Syrus, *Sermones in hebdomadam sanctam* 4,1: edit. Lamy 1,412. *Evangelii concordantis expositio* (from the Armenian version translated into Latin by I.B. Ancher), edit. G. Moesinger c.14 p.153f. From the same St. Ephraem can be added, *Sermo 2 in hebdom. Sanctam* n.4; *Sermo ad Nocturnum Dom. Resurrectionis* n.2; *Commentarium in Isaiam* 54,17; 62,2: edit. T.J. Lamy, 1,374.531; 2,156.186. N.B. R 706 translates it more accurately than Lamy does, but it places less correctly: "aedificabunt."

29. St. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 51,14,17: MG 41,913.921.

30. St. Basil, *De iudicio Dei* 7: MG 31,672.

31. St. Gregory Nazian., *Orationes* 32,18: MG 36,193.

32. St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio 2 de S.Stephano*: MG 46,733.

240. Didymus of Alexandria (ca. 390): “Among the Apostles Peter was the choryphaeus (κορυφαῖος = leader)... The prince of the Apostles (ὁ ἐπαρχος)... he who among the Apostles holds the first place” (τῷ προτεῖν). Also, “Peter was called blessed by him who alone is the blessed Lord. The Churches have been built upon this rock... the keys of heaven were given to him... Furthermore, he received power, or rather all also received it through him—not to reject sinners, but to receive them if they have a change of heart.”³³

241. St. John Chrysostom (ca. 395): *In Illud: Hoc scitote*: “Peter was the choryphaeus of that group, the mouth of all the Apostles, the head of that family, the prefect of the whole world, the foundation of the Church, the ardent lover of Christ.” *In S. Ignatium*: “whom Christ placed in charge of the whole world, to whom he gave the keys of heaven, into whose judgment he committed all things.” The same author, *In Matt.* 16:18-19: “And upon this rock I will build my Church, that is, on the faith of his confession. Hence he declares that many are going to believe, and he increases his understanding and constitutes him as the shepherd... But I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven... which belong to God alone, namely, to absolve sins, to make the Church firm in the midst of so many disturbances, to make the fisher of men more solid than rock when being attacked by the whole world, and he promises to give him these things in the whole world... The Father gave the revelation of the Son to Peter; but the Son commissioned him to disseminate knowledge both of the Father and of himself throughout the whole world, when he gave him the keys, who extends the Church to the whole world, and showed that it is more firm than the heavens.” Again by the same author, *In Io* 21:15-18: “Jesus says to Simon Peter: Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these?... Feed my sheep. And why, after passing over the others, does he speak to him about this? He was preeminent among the Apostles, the mouth of the disciples and the head of the group. Therefore Paul comes to see him instead of the others. At the same time he shows him that it is necessary continually to have faith; after the repentance for his denial, he commits to him the leadership (τὴν προσηγορίαν) of the brothers... But he says: If you love me, accept the leadership of the brothers, and now show that fervent love, which you have always manifested and about which you exult, and give for my sheep that life which you said you were going to give for me.”³⁴

242. Macarius Magnes (ca. 400) *In Matt.* 16:18: “Receive a name worthy of your grace and be Peter, manifesting to the whole world an impregnable rock that does not move; for you have received a mind and a judgment that is invincible... The one who said to him: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God—he raised him to the summit of dignity, when he made him the guardian of the keys and of the palace of the heavenly kingdom. For it was fitting that he who knew the King sitting on his throne in majesty should receive the power of closing and opening, so that he might enlighten those com-

33. Didymus Alex., *De Trinitate* 1,27; *In Actus Apostolorum* 10,10; *De Trinitate* 2,10; 1,30: MG 39, 408.1677.640.417.

34. St. John Chrysostom, *In illud: Hoc scitote* 4: MG 56,275; *In S. Ignatium martyrem* 4: MG 50,591; *In Matt.* 16:18f. homil.54,2: MG 58,534; *In Io* 21:15-18, homil.88,1: MG 59,478f.

ing in, as one knowing the strength of the powerful one, and might exclude those who are not capable of the blessed vision."³⁵

243. St. Cyril of Alexandria (ca. 428) *In Io* 1:42: "And [Christ] did not allow him to be called Simon any more, claiming him at that very moment by his power as his own, but with a fitting similarity it pleased him to be called Peter from the rock (*Petrum a petra*), that is, because he was going to build his Church on him."³⁶

244. Scholium 2. Virtual testimony from monuments of Archeology.³⁷

The relative number of representations of persons in archeological monuments indicates the preeminence of St. Peter: for, with the exception of pictures in which Jesus is shown as the Good Shepherd, which are innumerable, the image of Christ occurs in Garrucci 440 times. In the first place after Christ, the image of St. Peter is found 212 times; then St. Paul 47 times; then the college of Apostles, in which Peter is also included, 30 times; Moses 37 times; Daniel 11; Elijah 6. Besides the 212 times already mentioned, Peter is represented under the image of Moses 100 times. Therefore Peter in the N.T. is like Moses in the O.T.

In the archeological monuments Peter is easily recognized from the shape of his beard and his hair. Peter alone often occurs, from the end of the 2nd century, holding the keys; Peter is represented as a teacher, either as sitting on a rock and reading a book, or from the 4th century, sitting on a chair and teaching. Therefore the Primacy of Peter clearly appears.

245. The images in which Peter is assimilated to Moses are very frequent: There are some in which the Lord as a youth, holding a volume in his left hand and commanding with his right, points out a passage in the open volume to Peter, in which often the words appear: *Law* or *Law of God* or *The Lord Gives the Law* (about 30 times). There are others in which, as a second Moses, Peter strikes a rock with his rod and out of it flows water, from which often Roman soldiers drink (about 100 times); thus from the beginning of the 2nd century this representation begins to appear, and it is found in Rome, Pisa, Milan, Arles, Avignon, Narbonne, Marseilles, Matritus, Astorga, Gerione, Saragossa, etc. Sometimes Peter is represented carrying a lamb like the Good Shepherd. Thus Peter is shown as taking the place of Christ or as the Vicar of Christ.

35. Macarius Magnes, *Apocriticus* 3,27: edit. C. Blondel, 115.117.

36. St. Cyril of Alex., *In Io Evangel.* 2: MG 73,220.

37. R. Garrucci, *Storia dell'Arte Cristiana nei primi otto secoli della chiesa* v.1-6 (1872-1880). See S. Scaglia, O.C.R., *S.Petri Primatus et praeogativae ex Archaeologiae testimoniis* (1910); H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* (1925) n.505; Besson, *Saint Pierre* (1928); G. Wilpert, *La fede della Chiesa nascente secondo i monumenti dell'arte antica* (1938) c.6 S.Pietro p.146-216; *Esplorazioni sotto la Confessione di S.Pietro* (1951) 2 tables 7 and 8.

246. Objections. With the office of feeding in John 21:15 the Primacy was not given to Peter.

1. C. Weizsaecker: "It is incredible that in the Gospel of John the Apostle is extolled, who precedes John himself precisely by reason of his love: 'Do you love me more than these?' Therefore, either the text is not genuine, or with it the preeminence of Peter over John is not signified."³⁸

I deny the antecedent, keeping in mind the gospel of Peter and the history of John. *On the first consequent: I deny*, for the reason given, that the genuineness of the text can be doubted against the certain tradition of the text. *On the second consequent:* In the text the preeminence of Peter over John in regard to love is not signified, *I bypass the consequent:* the preeminence in authority freely bestowed by Christ on Peter, who loves him, is not signified, *denied*.

247. 2. But the words do not signify the preeminence of Peter in authority. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. John 21:15: The words signify the threefold ratification of the Apostolate which had been lost by the triple denial. Therefore they do not signify the Primacy.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Apostolate with the preeminent prerogative given to Peter alone above the others, *conceded*; of the Apostolate alone without the Primacy, *denied*.

3. But the words signify no preeminent prerogative. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. With these words no obligation of obeying is imposed on others. Therefore the words in John 21:15-17 do not signify a Primacy.

I distinguish the antecedent. No obligation is imposed explicitly, *conceded*; actually in a practical manner, *denied*.

4. But not even in a practical manner could an obligation be imposed towards Peter. Therefore, *the difficulty remains*.

"For in the Church of God supreme authority can belong completely only to Christ, living and present there *where two or three are gathered together in my name* (Matt.18:20)."³⁹

I distinguish the antecedent. In the Church of God supreme authority can belong only to Christ, who is present in it, primarily and properly and principally producing supernatural effects, *conceded*; by a secondary and vicarious right and in order to produce supernatural effects in a ministerial way, *denied*.

248. 5. But these words signify only the Apostolate. Therefore *the difficulty remains*.

The word "to feed" signifies only the teaching and to be a minister with a certain sacred authority. But this is the function of the Apostolate. Therefore....

I distinguish the major: The word "to feed" which can be predicated in the same way about several subjects, *conceded*: as it is predicated about one person, to whom is committed this authority over all the others, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same*

38. C. Weizsaecker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter* (1902) 532.

39. C.T. Craig, *L'Eglise du N.T. Etudes oecuméniques. Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu* (1949) I p.52f.

way and deny the consequent and the consequence.

6. But the word “to feed” in the Church must be predicated in the same way about several subjects. Therefore *the difficulty remains*.

Eph. 4:11: In the Church there must be several shepherds. Therefore “to feed” must be attributed to several.

I distinguish the antecedent. With a subordinate power, *conceded*; with supreme power, *denied*.

249. 7. But the power of Peter was subordinate to others. Therefore *the difficulty remains*. Acts 8:14; 11:2: Peter is sent out by others and he reports back to them. Therefore....

I distinguish the antecedent. He is sent out in an authoritative way and reports back because it is demanded authoritatively, *denied*; he is sent out after consultation and he reports back for the sake of giving information, *conceded*.⁴⁰

40. The difficulties against the following thesis, about the Vicar of Christ on earth, can also be brought to bear against this thesis. Also, see T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.8, Objections.

ARTICLE III

ST. PETER, VICAR OF CHRIST AND
SUPERIOR OF THE APOSTLES**Thesis 6. By reason of the Primacy St. Peter is the true Vicar of Christ on earth, to whom also the other Apostles were subject.**

250. S.Th., 4 CG 76; II-II, q. 88, a. 12 ad 3; III, q. 8, a. 6; *De regim. Princ.* 1,14; *In epist. ad Gal* 2,11; F. de Victoria, *De potestate Ecclesiae*; Ed. Getino, *Bibliot. De Tomistas Españoles* 10, rel.2 q.2 n.9-11.26; St. R. Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pontif.* I c.9; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.1; G. Wilmers, n.95 prop.45 and 60; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pont.* Th.6 and Prolog. § 17; C. Mazzella, th.37,5; De Groot, q.14 a.1; A. Straub, n.235ff.713f.; A. Michelitsch, § 217; M. D'Herbigny, th.14; E. Dorsch, p.170ff.; T. Zapelena, I p.230; Th. Granderath, *Constit. Dogmat.* 129-137; M. Maccarrone, *Vicarius Christi. Storia del titolo papale* (1952).

251. Connection. After we have proved that Christ himself immediately conferred his powers on his Apostles and the Primacy on St. Peter, we next ask about the relations, which by reason of the Primacy St. Peter had both to Christ and to the Apostles. We say that St. Peter related to Christ is his true Vicar on earth, related to the Apostles he is their true superior.

252. Definition of terms. The Primacy is supreme power over the whole Church. This power is not *delegated*, or merely given to a person, but it is *ordinary*, because by the institution of Christ it is connected firmly to the office of the Primacy which was established perpetually; this point will be proved separately in the following thesis 7.

But *ordinary power* can be either proper or vicarious. That ordinary power is *ordinary*, which is exercised by its subject in his own name and right. But that is said to be *vicarious*, which is exercised by its subject in the place of someone else to whom it belongs properly.

253. Accordingly, St. Peter is said to be the Vicar of Christ by reason of the Primacy, because he exercises his preeminent power, not in his own name and right, but in the place of and by the right of Christ. However, he is called the *true* Vicar of Christ, not merely apparent, because the power given to St. Peter *by vicarious right* truly is the very same that Christ had on earth *in his own right*.

254. The Apostles are those disciples, whom Christ named Apostles (Luke 6:13), and who with Peter constitute the *College of Twelve*. With equal name and right St. Paul must be joined to them, as we have already proved (thesis 2).

Their powers can be distinguished into ordinary and extraordinary. The *ordinary* are those which by the institution of Christ are firmly attached to their office of shepherding and are established perpetually; they can be reduced to the threefold power of teaching, sanctifying and governing the faithful committed to their care. The *extraordinary* are those powers which Christ gave to the Apostles during their lifetime to meet the extraordinary conditions of the first foundation of the Churches; therefore, they are not either ordinary, or attached by right to the firm office, or delegated by St. Peter concerning the ordinary powers given to him with the office of Primacy.

255. The principal *extraordinary* powers of the Apostles are: a) the immediate and complete mission and instruction accepted from Christ (Matt. 13:9-17; 28:19; Mark 4:34; Luke 24:44-49; John 14:25-26; 20:21; Acts 1:3-8; Gal. 1:11-18); b) the universal power of teaching, sanctifying and governing, where at least Christ had not been preached by another Apostle (Matt. 18:18; 28:19; Mark 16:15; Acts 1:8; Rom. 15:20f.); c) the prerogative of the foundation, by which every Church of Christ necessarily was to be built upon the Apostles (Eph. 2:20); d) personal infallibility in doctrine (1 Thess. 2:13; Gal. 1:6-9).

Also, the authors generally admit that other extraordinary gifts were bestowed on the Apostles, although they were accessory: examples would be the gifts of infused knowledge, of miracles, of confirmation in grace, and others of the same sort.¹

Subject to St. Peter by reason of the Primacy are said to be those who are bound by a true obligation of subordination with regard to the preeminent authority of St. Peter.

256. State of the question. We are saying that St. Peter by reason of the Primacy 1) is the true Vicar of Christ on earth; 2) is the real Superior of the Apostles themselves, in spite of their ordinary and extraordinary powers received from Christ.

257. Adversaries. All those who refuse to admit the Primacy of St. Peter, as is evident, also deny both parts of this thesis. In particular, Marsilius of Padua is opposed to both parts (D 942); also many Oriental schismatics, as is certain from their Encyclical Letter, published in 1848, signed by 33 Orthodox Bishops, in which they rejected the arguments given by Pope Pius IX on January 6, 1848, when he exhorted the Orientals to return to

1. See A. Straub, *De Ecclesia*, th.7 n.195-244.

union with Rome in his Encyclical, "*In suprema Petri Apostoli Sede.*"²

Wycliffe, Luther, Febronius or I.N. Hontheim and the *Synod of Pistoia* deny to Peter the authority of Vicar of Christ on earth (D 1187, 1506, 2592-2597, 2603).

258. The following say that St. Peter is in every way equal to the other Apostles:

The *Jansenist* Barcos teaches the complete equality between St. Peter and St. Paul; hence he was declared a heretic by Innocent X (D 1999);

The School of Tübingen, under the direction of Baur, also defends the equality between St. Peter and St. Paul; for, inquiring into the opposition of ideas out of which, according to Hegelian principles, the beginning and historical evolution of the Church must be explained, it finds it in *Petrinism*, that is, in a legal and national Christianity whose leader is said to have been St. Peter, and in *Paulinism*, that is, in a Christianity freed from the Law and universal, whose promoter is said to have been St. Paul. Hence the Primacy of St. Peter is nothing other than that leadership, which the legal and national faction of the primitive Church attributed to him over the other Apostles; but another equal leadership was attributed to St. Paul by the liberal and universal faction of the primitive Church.³

259. *Old Catholics* with Langen hold that no power was given to St. Peter, which from the Scriptures of the N.T. cannot be proved to have been given also to the other Apostles; wherefore St. Peter at most must be said to be first among equal Apostles. Many *Orthodox Orientals* say things similar to this, and some of them go further and attribute a certain primacy of St. Andrew over St. Peter.⁴

260. Doctrine of the Church. Both parts of the thesis must be said to be *infallibly defined* by John XXII against Marsilius of Padua (D 942), by the *Council of Florence* (D 1307), in the Tridentine profession of faith (D 1868) and by *Vatican Council I* (D 3059).

2. Pius IX, Encyclical "*In suprema Petri Apostoli Sede*" January 6, 1848: *Acta Pii IX* 1,78-91. *Synodus Constantinopolitana*, by which the doctrines of the Latins are condemned again in the Encyclical Letter, published in May 1848: Msi 40,377-418, especially 393-399f.

3. See RGG "Baur," I (1909) 817ff.; P. Jörg, *De Barcos del duplice Primato* (1941).

4. Langen, *Das vatikanische Dogma von dem Universal Episcopat und der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes in seinem Verhältnis zum Neuen Testament und der patristischen Exegese* .1-4 (1871-1876). Those Catholics call themselves *Old Catholics* who, under the leadership of Döllinger, refused to submit themselves to the decrees of Vatican Council I when it defined the Primacy and infallibility of St. Peter and his successors. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.206,3. For the opinions of the Orientals, see J. Jugie, *Theol. Dogm. Christ. Orientalium* 4,340-347.

The Magisterium of the Church often attributes the title of *Vicar of Christ* to St. Peter and his successors (D 1026, 1054, 1187, 1375, 1448, 1506, 2282, 2540, 2592-2597, 2603).⁵

You will also find the authority of St. Peter over the other Apostles defined by Clement VI (1052-1055) and by *Vatican Council I* (D 3050-3052, 3055f., 3065, 3067).

Leo XIII and Pius XII clearly teach the doctrine of both parts.

a) Leo XIII in the Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*," from Matt. 16:18f.; John 21:15ff.; Luke 22:32, he concludes: "For this reason Jesus Christ willed that Peter should participate in certain names, signs of great things which belong to himself alone: in order that identity of titles should show identity of power. So he who is himself 'the chief cornerstone in whom all the building being framed together, grows up in a holy temple in the Lord' (Eph. 2:21)... He who is the King of his Church, 'who has the key of David, who opens and no man shuts, who shuts and no man opens' (Rev. 3:7), having delivered *the keys* to Peter declared him Prince of the Christian commonwealth. So, too, he, the Good Shepherd (John 10:11), constituted Peter the pastor of his lambs and sheep... Finally, he who confirms 'in every good work and word' (2 Thess. 2:16) commands Peter 'to confirm his brethren.' Rightly, therefore, does St. Leo the Great say: 'From the whole world Peter alone is chosen to take the lead in calling all nations, to be the head of all the Apostles and of all the Fathers of the Church. So that, although in the people of God there are many priests and many pastors Peter should by right rule all of those over whom Christ himself is the chief ruler' (Leo the Great, *Sermon* 4,2). And again: "Christ the Lord, which has already been said sufficiently, handed on to Peter and his successors that they should be his *Vicars*, and that they should have the same power perpetually in the Church, which he himself had during his mortal life" (ASS 28,728f.736).

b) Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*" says: "Everyone knows that Christ the Lord... when he was about to leave this world and return to the Father, entrusted to the Prince of the Apostles the visible government of the whole society which he had founded... And it cannot be validly objected that by the establishment of a primacy of jurisdiction in the Church this mystical Body was given two heads. For in virtue of the Primacy Peter is none other than the Vicar of Christ, and therefore this Body has only one principal Head, namely Christ, who, continuing himself to govern the Church invisibly and directly, rules it visibly through his personal representative on earth" (AAS 35,210f.).

261. Theological note. Therefore the thesis is *define divined faith* with regard to both parts, especially against Marsilius of Padua, and also in the Councils of Florence and Vatican I (D 942, 1307, 3055-3060).

262. Proof of the first part: By reason of the Primacy St. Peter is the true Vicar of Christ on earth.

5. M. Maccarrone, *Vicarius Christi. Storia del titolo papale* (1952).

The true Vicar of Christ on earth is the man who, in the place of and with the right of Christ, obtains on earth the power itself, which Christ as man had on earth by his own right. But by reason of the Primacy St. Peter in the place of and by the right of Christ obtains on earth that power, which Christ as man on earth had by his own right. Therefore by reason of the Primacy St. Peter is the true Vicar of Christ on earth.

The major is clear from the definition itself of the Vicar of Christ.

263. *The minor* is proved from Matt. 16:18f.: *and on this rock I will build by Church...*, and from John 21:16f.: *Feed my sheep; feed my lambs*. Hence it is like this: By reason of the Primacy St. Peter in the Church, not his but Christ's, in the flock, not his but Christ's, is like the foundational Rock, the universal Key-bearer, the supreme Judge, the supreme Shepherd of Christ's faithful. Therefore St. Peter, not in his own name and right, but in the place of and by the right of Christ, obtains on earth the supreme power of the Church. But such power is that which Christ as man had on earth by his own right. Therefore, by reason of the Primacy St. Peter is the true Vicar of Christ on earth.

264. Proof of the last *minor*. Christ as man by his own inalienable right was and remains: a) The King and Lord of all things (Rev. 19:16); b) *The principal Rock and corner-stone*, on which the whole Church is built (Matt. 21:42-44; 1 Pet. 2:4-8; Acts 4:11; Eph. 2:20-22; 1 Cor. 10:4; 3:11); c) The invincible Key-bearer, because *he has the key of David, who opens and no one shall shut, who shuts and no one opens* (Rev. 3:7); d) The absolute Judge, because *the Father has given all judgment to the Son* (John 5:22); e) *The Good Shepherd, the Chief Shepherd and the great Shepherd of the sheep* (John 10:2.11.14; 1 Pet. 5:4; Heb. 13:20). Therefore the primatial power of St. Peter is the same as that which Christ as man had in his own right.

265. The following authors *confirm* and explain this doctrine about the Vicar of Christ on earth: An anonymous author (ca. 260) writes: "The divine and paternal piety conferred on us the guidance of the apostolate and he ordained the vicarious seat of the Lord with heavenly dignity and in our superior we have the origin of the authentic apostolate, on which Christ founded the Church" (Kch 310).⁶

St. Ambrose (ca 387) when he says: "The Lord asks, Do you love me? not in order to learn but in order to teach him; after his Ascension into heaven, because of his love he left him as his Vicar for us."⁷

6. *Adversus Aleatores de Primatu* c.1,2: ML 4,827; CSEL 3,92.

7. St. Ambrose, *Expositio Evang.S.Lucae* 1.10 n.175: ML 15,1848.

266. St. Augustine (ca. 410): "The Lord, he said, commended his sheep to Peter, not Peter's sheep, so that he might not feed himself but the Lord. Christ is truly the one advocate (1 John 2:1) just as he is the one Shepherd (John 10:16). Like Christ the Shepherd, is not Peter a shepherd? Yes, Peter is also a shepherd. For, if he is not a shepherd, why did he say to him, feed my sheep? (John 21:17). But he is a true shepherd, who feeds his sheep. For to Peter it was said, not, to feed your sheep, but mine. Therefore, Peter not in himself, but in the body of the Shepherd is shepherd."⁸

267. St. Leo the Great (ca. 450) teaches: "Because you are Peter: that is, since I am an inviolable rock... I am the foundation in place of which no one can place another; however, you also are a rock, because you are firm with my power, so that what belongs to me by my own power, may belong to you in a common participation with me."⁹

Innocent III (ca. 1200) says: "As Peter designated himself the only Vicar of Christ, by miraculously walking to the Lord on the waters of the sea, and he himself miraculously walked on the waters of the sea." "The Lord appointed for himself only Peter both as his Vicar and as his successor in teaching." "And although the first and principal foundation of the Church is the only-begotten Son of God, Jesus Christ, still the second and secondary foundation of the Church is Peter."¹⁰

268. Therefore Christ the Lord, who by his own power and right truly said of himself: *I am the light of the world* (John 8:12), because of the power communicated to the Apostles, could also truly say: *You are the light of the world* (Matt. 5:14). Therefore similarly the same Christ, who by his own inalienable power and right is the Rock, the Key-bearer, the Judge and Shepherd in his Church, truly also constituted St. Peter the Rock, Key-bearer, Judge and Shepherd, by participation in his power and vicarious right, over the whole Church and the universal flock of Christ's faithful: Leo XIII as quoted in n.260.

269. Proof of the second part. By reason of the Primacy also the other Apostles were subject to St. Peter.

a) From Matt. 16:16-19: By reason of the Primacy St. Peter is like the foundation, the key-bearer and supreme judge, to whom all things in the Church are subject. But the other Apostles are members of the Church. Therefore by reason of the Primacy also the other Apostles were subject to St. Peter.

b) From John 21:15-18: By reason of the Primacy St. Peter is like the one Shepherd, to whom all Christ's sheep and lambs are subject. But the Apostles are also some of Christ's sheep (Matt. 26:31; John 10:9-11.25-27).

8. St. Augustine, *Sermo* 285 n.3.5.6: ML 38,1291.

9. St. Leo the Great, *Sermo* 4: ML 54,150.

10. Innocent III, *Ad Patriarcham Constantinopolitanum: Apostolicae Sedis Primatus*: ML 214,759f.

Therefore by reason of the Primacy also the other Apostles were subject to St. Peter.

c) From Luke 22:31f.: By reason of the Primacy St. Peter also received from Christ the office of confirming the other Apostles. But to this office of confirming necessarily corresponds a true obligation of subordination of the Apostles to St. Peter. Therefore by reason of the Primacy the other Apostles truly were subject to St. Peter.

270. *The same second part is confirmed* for several reasons, whereby in the N.T. the precedence of St. Peter over the other Apostles either is shown or is supported or is alluded to.¹¹

a) *St. Peter is always mentioned first*, and is acknowledged as “the first” among the Apostles (Mark 3:16; Luke 6:14; Acts 1:13, St. Peter is cited in the first place). Matt. 10:2 *First (πρώτος), Simon, who is called Peter*. Mark 1:36 *Simon and those who were with him*; Luke 9:32 *Peter and those who were with him*: you can infer the force of this expression from Acts 5:17 *the high priest and those who were with him*. Acts 2:14 *But Peter standing with the eleven*: there are expressions like this in Acts 2:37 and 5:29.

271. b) *St. Peter takes the first place among the Apostles*, when he directs and controls serious affairs: 1) In the election of the Apostle to take the place of Judas. St. Peter not undeservedly should be thought to be taking the place of Christ (Acts 1:15-17; 21-26). 2) In settling controversies of great importance, for example, whether for the Gentiles circumcision and observance of the Mosaic Law should be declared necessary for salvation or not (Acts 15:1.5); in this matter the opinion of St. Peter was decisive and definitive (Acts 15:6-12).

c) *St. Peter takes the first place among the Apostles in the exercise of the powers received from Christ*: in preaching about the death and resurrection of Christ (Acts 2:14; 3:12; 4:8; 5:29); in the judgment of Ananias and Simon (Acts 5:1; 8:20); in admitting the Gentiles into the Church without any Jewish burdens (Acts 10—11; see Acts 15:7); in miracles whereby God confirmed the preaching and authority of St. Peter (Acts 3:1ff.; 5:12ff.; 9:34-40).¹²

272. *The same second part is confirmed further from St. Paul who, in a sufficiently clear manner, acknowledged St. Peter's authority over himself.*¹³

a) From Gal. 1:18f.: *Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit*

11. In the letter just quoted above, *Apostolicae Sedis Primatu*, by Innocent III: ML 214,758-765, this argument is explained at great length.

VI. Soloviev, *La Russe et l'Eglise universelle* (1889) 154, against the Orientals who, against the authority of St. Peter and of the Theologians, refuse to admit that the Primacy of St. Peter is contained in the history of the N.T., emphasizes these statistical data: Of the disciples of Christ, in the Gospels and in the Acts of the Apostles, St. Peter is mentioned 171 times, St. John 46 times; but the remaining disciples occur rarely; P.C. Ceulemans, *In Matt 10,2*.

12. See more about this argument in D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* th.14; O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre*, p.19-22.

13. See D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.162.

(ἰστορήσαι) *Cephas... but I saw none of the other Apostles*. The reason for this visit is nothing other than the supreme authority of Peter, As Marius Victorinus said very well: "If the foundation of the Church is placed in Peter, as is stated in the gospel; since everything had been revealed to him, Paul knew that he ought to see Peter, as the one to whom such authority had been given by Christ, but not in order to learn something from him."¹⁴

273. St. John Chrysostom agrees with the above: "Since he did not need anything from Peter... nevertheless he went up as to someone greater and more senior, but not in order to learn something from him. As he said, 'I went up in order to visit Peter.' He did not say ἰδεῖν, that is, to see Peter, but ἰστορήσαι, that is, in order to visit him and get to know him—in the way in which people are accustomed to speak who visit large and renowned cities for the sake of getting to know them. So he judged it necessary to see only that man... for he says that he did not go up to Jerusalem because of the other Apostles, but only because of this one."¹⁵

274. b) From Gal. 2:7f.: *I was entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as (καθώς) Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised (for he who worked through Peter for the mission of the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles)*. St. Paul equates (καθώς) his mission to that of Peter alone, although the same mission had been conferred on all the Twelve Apostles; because both he himself and the Judaizers, to whom he is referring, acknowledged St. Peter alone as the leader of the whole apostolate or the Primate of the Church.¹⁶

275. c) From Gal. 2:11-21: *But when Cephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned...because he was not straightforward about the truth of the gospel*: not because he was in error, but because he did not accommodate his way of acting with the truth. The authority of Peter was so great that when he "simulated" the observance of the Jewish Law, he would attract others to follow him, even Barnabas himself, and embrace the same simulation. But St. Paul in reprehending him, does not appeal, as he could have, to the decree of Jerusalem (Acts 15:28f.), but to the opinion of St. Peter himself; this was the same for both Apostles, for otherwise St. Paul would not have argued from it while writing for himself to the Galatians, but the greater authority of Peter was acknowledged by all.

276. Finally, St. Paul considers it important to have resisted Peter to his face, which of course would not be important unless he acknowledged St. Peter as being his superior, as St. John Chrysostom correctly pointed out: "It is manifest... that Peter (the first of the Apostles, to whom the sheep had been entrusted by Christ) is the one about whom all of these things are said. For, he says that he resisted him to his face and that he considers

14. Mar. Victorinus, *In epist. ad Gal* 1:18: ML 8,1155.

15. St. John Chrysostom, *In epist. ad Gal* 1:18: MG 61,631f.

16. See R. Cornely, *Comment. in epist ad Gal* 2,7f.

it to be important indicates nothing other than that he has respect for the dignity of the person: furthermore, if he had said about any other person that he had resisted him to his face, in no way would he have considered it important. Also, if Peter had been anyone else, his change would not have been so important that he would also influence other Jews... he would only withdraw and separate himself: but that withdrawal and separation, because of the dignity of the person, could draw with it all the other disciples."¹⁷

277. Scholium. *On the nature of reconciling the extraordinary powers given to the Apostles by Christ with their subordination to Peter by reason of the Primacy.*

Because of the difficulty of this matter, a few authors deny that Christ gave some powers to the Apostles, which we have called extraordinary, especially a universal jurisdiction; they say that a more extensive jurisdiction, besides the ordinary one they already had, was given to them by a delegation that was tacit or express from Peter. Those usually cited in favor of this opinion are Torquemada and Jacobatius among the earlier theologians; among the more recent are Billot and Michelitsch.¹⁸

More common by far is the opinion of those who hold that Christ conferred on the Apostles also extraordinary universal jurisdiction, at least where the gospel had not already been preached by another Apostle (Rom. 15:20f.). Among others, those holding this opinion are: Victoria, St. Robert Bellarmine, Suarez, Franzelin, Mazzella, Passaglia, Palmieri, Pesch, De Groot, Straub, Wilmers, Dieckmann, Dorsch, Journet.¹⁹

278. Therefore, having supposed also the extraordinary universal jurisdiction of the Apostles, their power can be aptly reconciled with their subordination due to St. Peter by reason of the Primacy, according to this principle: although by reason of the Apostolate they were equal to St. Peter, still by reason of the Primacy they were subject to St. Peter, and indeed not only indirectly, but also directly.

1) *Indirectly*, inasmuch as all the fruits of the labors and powers of the Apostles had to be submitted to the supreme authority of St. Peter, so that he alone would be the visible Foundation, Key-bearer, Judge and supreme Shepherd of everyone in the Church.

279. 2) *Directly* also, and surely both in the first reality (= being), and in the second reality (= action).

a) *In the first reality*, that is, considering the power in itself, the power of St. Peter was greater, both extensively and intensively. Extensively, because St. Peter had under

17. St. John Chrysostom, *Homil. in illud: "in faciem ei restiti"* n.15: MG 51,383f.

18. John de Torquemada, *Summa de Ecclesia* l.2 c.54; Jacobatius, *De Concilio* l.10 a.7; Dom Grea, *De l'Eglise*, l.2 c.10; L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* th.26 § 2; A. Michelitsch, *Apologetica sive Theol. Fundam.* § 217; Bouché, DDC "Apostolat," I 685-689.

19. F. de Victoria, *De potestate Ecclesiae* rel.2 q.2 n.10f.26; St. R. Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pontifice* l.1 c.9; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.1 n.12; C. Mazzella, *De Religione et Ecclesia* n.880-887; J.B. Franzelin, *De Traditione*, th.5; C. Passaglia, *De Ecclesia* l.3 c.9; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontifice* th.6; Ch. Pesch, *Praelectiones* I n.279f.; D. Groot, *De Ecclesia* q.14 a.1 and 4; S. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.238ff.; G. Wilmers, *De Christi Ecclesia* n.179f.; H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.458; E. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* p.170-173; C. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1,135-167.

himself also the Apostles and all the churches founded by each one of them anywhere in the world. Intensively also both over the Apostles and over the other faithful: for, St. Peter alone could authoritatively direct and correct the affairs of the other Apostles, and also correct those things which perhaps were arranged by them less properly concerning the discipline of the churches; but only St. Peter could authoritatively bind the other faithful by a law, which could not be unbound by any other Apostle, or free them from a disciplinary law imposed by any other Apostle.

b) *In the second reality*, that is, the exercise of power, which we said St. Peter had in the first reality (actually) over the Apostles; in virtue of this the office was given to St. Peter by Christ of feeding, confirming, loosing or binding (if that were necessary) the Apostles themselves, taken both individually and collectively, who were required to obey St. Peter's precepts.

280. Objections. 1. The Apostles had received from Christ an extensive mission (John 20:21), universal power (Matt. 28:19), the supreme faculty of discerning and judging (Matt. 18:18). Therefore they could not be subjected to any superior power of a man.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Apostles as a College whose Head was Peter, *conceded*; the Apostles individually, *I subdistinguish*: with Peter and under Peter, *conceded*; independently of Peter, *denied*.

On this point Innocent III said: "If you find that this was said to the Apostles taken together, but not to the others without him (Peter), you will see that the faculty of binding and loosing was given to him without the others; so that what the others did not have without him, he without them could do because of the privilege conferred on him by the Lord and because of the received fullness of power."²⁰

281. 2. From Gal. 1:8f. St. Paul acknowledges no power of any creature above himself. Therefore not that of Peter.

I distinguish the antecedent. No power of a creature, which could announce a Gospel contrary to the Gospel revealed to him by Christ, *conceded*; no power given to a man by Christ, to which he should submit himself, *denied*.

Contrary to the teaching of the Apostles (Acts 15:10f.28), the Judaizers were advocating that, in addition to baptism and the law of Christ, circumcision and the Law of Moses were necessary for salvation (Acts 15:1.5). St. Paul writes to the Galatians against them: "Even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed" (Gal. 1:8f.).

282. 3. From Gal. 2:7-9. St. Paul says that he is equal to St. Peter in authority. Therefore he denies that a power was given to him by Christ, to which he had to submit.

I distinguish the antecedent. St. Paul says that he is equal to St. Peter by reason of the apostolate, *conceded*; excluding the Primacy of St. Peter, *denied*.

20. Innocent III: ML 214,760. See what was debated at length about this matter at Vatican Council I in Grand-erath, *Constitutiones dogmaticae* 129-137.

In the same place St. Paul says that the authority of St. Peter is restricted to the Jews. Therefore he excludes his universal Primacy.

I distinguish the antecedent. St. Paul says that the authority of the apostolate, which he de facto exercised among the Gentiles, is equal to the authority of the apostolate which St. Peter de facto exercised among the Jews, because both were similarly de facto divinely approved both in their fruits and with miracles, *conceded*; St. Paul says that the authority of St. Peter is restricted to the Jews only, *denied*.

St. Paul is looking at the distribution of apostolic labors, which de facto at that time was of such a nature that, not exclusively but primarily, St. Peter evangelized the Jews, but St. Paul the Gentiles; although St. Peter also brought the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7.14), and St. Paul at first to the Jews (Acts 13:14ff.46ff.).

283. 4. From Gal. 2:11. St. Paul in the presence of Gentiles reprimanded St. Peter. Therefore he supposes that his authority does not extend to the Gentiles.

I distinguish the antecedent. He reprimands correcting him fraternally, *conceded*; authoritatively, *denied*.

5. From Gal. 2:14. St. Paul corrects St. Peter in his teaching. But correction of teaching cannot not be authoritative. Therefore St. Paul corrects St. Peter authoritatively as a subject.

I distinguish the antecedent. St. Paul corrects St. Peter for an error in teaching, *denied*; he corrects St. Peter because of his way of acting, because it was less suited to the truth of the teaching, *I subdistinguish*: extrinsically or by reason of those who could be led into doctrinal error because of that way of acting, *conceded*; intrinsically or by reason of the teaching of the truth, *denied*.

284. The truth of the teaching, that must be held by all, is this: that the observance of the Mosaic Law for Christians, in addition to the Law of Christ, is not necessary for salvation, but they are free to observe it if they wish.²¹ Therefore de facto to observe it could not be said to be forbidden *intrinsically*, or by reason of the truth itself of the teaching; but *extrinsically* or by reason of scandal, namely, if ordinary Christians from its observance might conclude from the circumstances, although falsely, that it is necessary, it could be forbidden in order to avoid the fall of the little ones, according to the teaching of St. Paul himself about the eating of meat that had been offered to the pagan gods (1 Cor. 8:4-13); and so Paul himself, when he took on Timothy as a companion, *circumcised him because of the Jews* (Acts 16:3). Rightly therefore Tertullian said, "surely this was a fault in his companionship, not in his preaching" (*De praescriptione* 23: R 294).

21. While Christ was alive "they observed together both the Law and the Gospel"; hence from the passion up until proclamation of the Gospel the Law was dead, but not dead, and therefore the Jews "could licitly observe the legal requirements" (Pius XII, "*Mystici Corporis*": AAS 35,205f.; S.Th. I-II, q. 103, a. 4 ad 1).

CHAPTER III

On the perpetuity of the Church

ARTICLE I

THE PERPETUITY OF THE HIERARCHY OF THE
CHURCH AND OF THE PRIMACY

Thesis 7. The Church as it was instituted by Christ, and in it particularly the Hierarchy and the Primacy, from the will of Christ are perpetual.

285. S.Th. I-II, q. 106, a. 4; 4 CG 74; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.8 n.1; I.B. Franzelin, th.11; D. Palmieri, *Proleg. De Ecclesia* th.8; De San, part 3 c.1; G. Wilmers, th.10-13; I. Ottiger, th.8; C. Mazzella, th.32; H. Dieckmann, th.15; M. D'Herbigny, th.5; L. Lercher, th.31; A.C. Cotter, th.26; T. Zapelena, th.6 part 2; A. Straub, th.12-14.

286. Connection. We have proved that Jesus established the Church as a religious society of men—hierarchical and monarchical. Now we say that it is going to last until the end of the world, and also in such a way that it can neither fail in its essentials nor be replaced by some other economy of salvation, as the Church of Christ replaced the Synagogue. The thesis affirms this, not about particular churches, but about the universal Church.

287. Definition of terms. *The Church* is understood, not as existing in this or in some other particular place, but as it exists on the whole earth.

As it was instituted by Christ, that is, as others prefer to say—in its essentials: that is, as a religious society, destined for all men, and endowed with the task of teaching, sanctifying and governing.

A hierarchy is a sacred leadership, both because the office itself has been determined positively by God, and because the subject exercising it is designated positively by divine law, as we have explained in thesis 3.

Primacy is the supreme hierarchical power of the Church, which is exercised by one physical person by divine right, as was declared in theses 4 and 5.

288. Perpetuity is continuance in existence. Two forms are distinguished: one absolute and the other relative. *Absolute* is that which is independent of every condition. *Relative* is that which depends on some condition. Since the Church is a society of men, its perpetuity necessarily depends at least

on this condition, namely, as long as there are men on this earth.

There is also another twofold distinction of perpetuity: a) *Contingent or factual perpetuity* is the fact of the continuance in existence of some thing, but which can always cease to exist. b) *Necessary or rightful perpetuity* is the necessity of continuing in existence coming from a cause which renders the ending of the thing impossible. Therefore this rightful perpetuity is the same as the simple indefectibility of the thing, which can be *internal* or *external*, according as it proceeds from an internal cause or from the nature of the thing, or it comes from an external cause as, for example, from the efficacious assistance of God.¹

289. State of the question. We are asserting the necessary or indefectible perpetuity of the universal Church and of its Hierarchy and Primacy, coming from an external cause or from the efficacious assistance of God; however, it is not an absolute, but relative indefectibility, that is, for as long as there are men on earth.

The importance of this thesis is evident from the fact that it established a firm foundation according to which the true Church of Christ can be distinguished from the false ones.

290. Many adversaries were cited in Vatican Council I,² but we can summarize them into two classes:

1) *The pessimists*, who hold either that the Church already in their time ceased to exist, or at least that it can fail. Holding this view in the 4th and 5th centuries were the *Donatists*, who therefore re-baptized Catholic Christians (D 912), and so St. Augustine spoke out strongly against them, saying "Christ is the one who baptizes."³ In the 14th century the *Fraticelli* taught things similar to this (D 911f., 915).

But the *Socinians*, about the year 1590, contended that the divinely promised perpetuity of the Church is only defectible or dependent on the freedom of men. The *Protestants* since the 16th century have contended that the visible Church is corrupt in several of its essentials, especially by the Roman Primacy.⁴ Finally, the *Synod of Pistoia*, at the end of the 18th century, said that the Church has erred in doctrine concerning the more important truths of faith and morals (D 2601).

1. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.6, part 2.

2. Msi 51,542.552.574-578.

3. St. Augustine, *Epist.* 89 n.5: ML 33,312; Id., *Contra epist. Parmeniani* 1,2,3: "they wanted to banish Christ from the world, which they already began to possess" (ML 43,36).

4. See also the precursors of the Protestants, namely, Wycliffe (D 1159, 1187, 1194), and also Hus (D 1228).

291. 2) *Innumerable sects of Illuminists* expecting a new and more perfect economy of salvation. In the 3rd century the *Manicheans* and *Montanists* held that a new revelation was given to the heresiarchs Manes and Montanus, and they said that Manes and Montanus are instruments of the Holy Spirit or the Paraclete himself whom Christ had promised (John 14:16.26). At the end of his life Tertullian also joined the sect of Montanus.⁵

Moslems, since the middle of the 7th century, read in the Qur'an (Sura 61,6): "Jesus the son of Mary said to the people: I am the Apostle of God sent to you to confirm the Pentateuch which was given to you before my coming, and to announce that an Apostle will come after me, whose name will be Ahmed."

At the beginning of the 13th century the Abbot Joachim died in Italy and Almarichus de Bena in France; after the revelation of the Father in the O.T., which St. Peter represented, and after the revelation of the Son in the N.T., which St. Paul defended, they announced the advent of the "eternal Gospel" revealed by the Holy Spirit, which St. John foretold in the book of Revelation. Peter John Olivi (+1298) perfected their teachings and he has been acknowledged as the classical author of the "Spirituals."⁶

In the 19th and 20th centuries some Protestants adapted for themselves this theory of the triple economy. They hold that after the Church of Peter which is the Church of works and authority (the Catholic Church), and after the Church of Paul which is the Church of faith and freedom or the Protestant Church defended by Luther and Calvin, the Church of John is to be expected, which is the Church of love and of the Spirit: thus Döllinger. A similar threefold distinction of the Churches is dear to the *Ecumenists*.⁷

292. *From Protestantism* and proceeding naturally from it, there have come other sects that have either expected a new revelation or have said that it has already taken place. Of this sort are the *Anabaptists* or the re-baptizers founded in the 16th century by Melchior Hoffmann and flourished especially in Flanders, Germany and Switzerland; the *Quakers* in England in the 17th century having for their founder George Fox; *Swedenborgians* in the 18th century in Scandinavia—so called from their prophet Swedenborn, who was born in Stockholm; in the 19th century, the *Irvingians* in England and the *Mormons* in the United States of America, whose prophets were the

5. See Eusebius Caesar., *Hist. eccles.* 5,16,7.10; 5,17,4; 5,18,5: GChS 9,1: MG 20,465-468, 473-477. See H. Dieckmann, n.379. See St. Augustine, *De haeres.* 26 and 46: ML 42,30.34-38.

6. See M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (1933) 43; E. Benz, *Ecclesia spiritualis* (1934); J. Hergenröther, *Historia de la Iglesia* t.4 p.92,99.

7. Io. Wieser, *Die Döllingersche Dreikirchenidee* (1875); N. Soederblom, *Sermo finalis in Conventu pro unione Ecclesiarum* (1925). See S. Zankow, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum* (1928) 134; O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) 200.

Scot, Irving, and the American, Smith. Therefore, these innovators either expected "the light that enlightens every man coming into this world" (John 1:9), or their prophets preached that it had already arrived. From this same tendency there was the development in London, on June 24, 1717, of the so-called *Masons*, who were seeking light from "the Great Orient."⁸

293. 3) All *Evolutionists* are also opposed to this thesis, since they hold that the Church is subject to continuous and essential evolutionary change. From them the *Modernists* borrowed their teachings on the continuing evolution of the Church, which Pius X condemned in the Decree "*Lamentabili*" (D 3453, 3458, 3460).

Also very many Protestants refuse to admit the immutability of the Hierarchy, especially Lutherans and Calvinists, and they have done this since the 16th century.

The perpetuity of the *Primacy* is also denied by *non-Catholics* and *Schismatic Orientals*, who either simply do not admit the Primacy or say that it was only a personal prerogative of St. Peter; this matter was treated in theses 4 and 5.

294. Doctrine of the Church. 1) *The perpetuity of the Primacy* is defined explicitly and directly in Vatican Council I (D 3056f.).

2) *The perpetuity of the Church* explicitly, but indirectly, is defined by the same Council (D 3050-3052, 3056f.).

3) The Vatican Council implicitly defined the perpetuity of the Hierarchy. For, it explicitly defined the perpetuity of the Primacy (D 3056f.). But it also defined that it is proper to the Primacy to have subordinate to itself and to govern the Pastors or Bishops of the universal Church (D 3060-3064). Therefore there will always be Pastors or Bishops subordinate to the Primacy. This very point is taught explicitly in the prologue of the *Constitution on the Church* (D 3050-3052).

4) That *the hierarchical manner of the constitution of the subject of offices* was established by God was defined by Pius VI in the *Constitution "Auctorem fidei"* and by the Council of Trent (D 2602, 1767-1770, 1777).

Leo XIII in the Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" teaches the perpetuity of the Church and of the Primacy: "The Church is the Body of Christ endowed with supernatural life... Since, however, the Church is by the will and divine constitution *of the same kind*, it must continue without any intermission *of the same kind* for all eternity: if it is not permanent, certainly it could not have been established for perpetuity, which is contrary to

8. C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa e le Chiese* (1944) 268.646.692. See M. D'Herbigny, n.55; C. Crivelli, *Pequeño diccionario de las sectas protestantes* (1948).

the truth." "The office of Christ is to bring to salvation what was lost, that is, not just some nations or cities, but absolutely all men, with no distinction of places or times, the whole human race (John 3:17; Acts 4:12)... The Church, therefore, is bound to spread out widely among all men and to transmit through all ages the salvation effected by Jesus Christ and the blessings flowing therefrom. Wherefore, by the will of her Founder, it is necessary that this Church should be one in all lands and in all times... Therefore the Church of Christ is unique and perpetual" (D 3303). "*And the powers of death shall not prevail against it* (Matt. 16:18). The force of this divine statement is: Whatever power of visible or invisible enemies, whatever skills they may make use of, it will never come about that the Church founded on Peter will succumb, or in any way cease to be. Therefore God commended his Church to Peter so that as its invincible guardian he will keep it safe *perpetually*" (ASS 28,710ff.714.727).

295. *At Vatican Council I* a formal and explicit definition of the Church's perpetuity was prepared, against all the adversaries which we mentioned according to the Acts of the same Council. *For, in the first draft* of the Constitution on the Church two canons had been proposed: 7 (Against the Pessimists.) "If any one says that the same Church of Christ can be overcome by darkness, or be corrupted with evils, by which it would stray from the salvific truth of faith and morals, or be diverted from its original institution, or finally having been perverted and corrupted would cease to exist, let him be anathema." 8 (Against the Illuminists.) "If any one says that the present Church of Christ is not the final and supreme economy for obtaining salvation, but that another one is to be expected through a new and fuller effusion of the Holy Spirit, let him be anathema." From the Acts of the Council it is certain that none of the Fathers proposed anything against these canons, but only that accidental and stylistic changes were suggested by some in the discussion of the draft.⁹

296. *In the revised draft* the same definition essentially was proposed. Only from canon 7 the words were removed, "by which it would stray from the salvific truth of faith and morals," because in these words the infallibility of the Church was contained, which the Fathers thought was properly and more accurately defined in another canon. Therefore, in this second draft a proposal was made only about perpetuity: "Can. 14: If any one says that the Church was not constituted by Christ our Lord with a certain law and immutable form; or that it could be corrupted so that at some time it would cease to exist, or degenerate from its first constitution, let him be anathema." 15: "If any one says that this Church of Christ is not the final economy of salvation, or that another through a fuller effusion of the Holy Spirit is to be expected, let him be anathema."¹⁰ Of these canons the *Pessimists* were condemned by the first one, and the *Illuminists* by the second.

297. Theological note. The thesis as to its three parts expresses a doctrine that is *a matter of Catholic faith*; in fact, *with a solemn judgment*

9. Msi 51,552.848.926.

10. Msi 53,317.

the following was defined by Vatican Council I: explicitly the perpetuity of the Primacy, but implicitly the perpetuity of the Hierarchy, explicitly but indirectly the perpetuity of the Church; the direct definition of the Church had already been prepared.

298. Proof of the perpetuity. 1) of the Church, 2) of the Hierarchy, 3) of the Primacy.

Part 1: The Church will continue to exist perpetually until the end of the world.

A) Because it is, 1) the final economy of religion that will remain until the last judgment; 2) it will be strengthened by the efficacious assistance of God until the end of the world; 3) it will never be overcome by death or at least by hostile powers. Therefore, the Church will remain perpetually until the end of the world.

The antecedent is proved from the clear testimony of Christ.

1. *The Church is the final economy of salvation* that will continue to exist until the last judgment, according to the testimony of Christ in the parable of the weeds.

a) *The parable of the weeds* (Matt. 13:24-30).

Together in the same field	{	Householder—wheat—into the barn	} harvest- separation
		the enemy—weeds—into the fire	

b) *Explanation of the parable* (Matt. 13:36-43).

Together in the world	{	Christ—his faithful—into heaven	} end of the world – judgment
		Devil—evil men—into hell	

c) Note that the consummation of the world and the judgment, mentioned in the parable, agree with what is said in the sermon about the last judgment (Matt. 25:31-33.46).

299. d) Now follows our argument from the above. In this parable Christ taught and testified that the Kingdom of God, existing in the condition of this time, will continue to exist until the last judgment at the end of the world. But the Kingdom of God existing in the conditions of this time is the Church of Christ. Therefore Christ taught and testified that his Church will continue to exist until the last judgment at the end of the world.

The major is clear from the explanation of the parable given by Christ

himself; and in it it is certain that the explanation is about the Kingdom of God existing in the conditions of this time, because only in the conditions of this time can the good persons be mixed together with evil men. Therefore the parable expresses the perpetuity of the *fact* of the Kingdom of God.

The minor has been proved already in thesis 3 on the institution of the Church.

e) A similar proof can also be made from the parable of the net (Matt. 13:47-50). Hence St. Thomas said well: "No other state will succeed the state of the New Law... Nothing can approach nearer to the last end than that which is the immediate cause of our being brought to the last end."¹¹

300. 2. *The Church is made firm by the efficacious assistance of God* until the end of the world, according to the clear testimony of Christ (Matt. 28:18-20; John 14:16f.26).

a) *Regarding the text* of Matt. 28:18-20, note the words: *All authority has been given to me... Go therefore and teach all nations... and lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age*, in which Christ straightforwardly, *because he possesses all power*, absolutely commands that his mission be carried out and he proclaims his infallible assistance until the end of the world as absolutely future. To the word "lo" (ἰδοὺ) Zorell rightly says: "What is promised is stated vigorously to be very important"; to the words "I am with you" Palmieri rightly says: "in the Scriptures they mean the assistance of God with success," that is, efficacious assistance. Recently Holzmeister demonstrated the same point; for, having considered all the places in Scripture in which these words occur, he draws the conclusion: Wherever this formula in Scripture is applied to some person, it signifies: 1) that an important office is given to him by God, which will have to be carried out in the midst of huge difficulties; 2) but that a singular and efficacious help is conferred by God, in virtue of which a happy fulfillment of the office is announced prophetically (see Gen. 26:24; Exod. 3:10-17; Deut. 31:23; Josh. 1:5.9; 3:7; Judg. 6:12; Isa. 41:10-16; 43:1-5; Jer. 1:4-8.18f.; 15:20; 30:10f.; 42:11; 46:28; Matt. 28:20; Acts 18:9f.). See other texts, about one hundred, in Holzmeister.¹²

301. b) *Regarding the text* of John 14:16f.26, note the words: "He will give you another Counselor, to be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, who will be in you... he will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have *said* to you"; with these words Christ openly announces as absolutely future the gift of the Counselor, infallibly remaining with the Apostles forever and teaching and reminding them of everything. Regarding the words "Counselor" and "in my name" Knabenbauer says: "signify that the one who calls for help receives protection in that matter, and he remains as a helper, defender, protector and advocate" (1 John 2:1): "a powerful helper,

11. S.Th. I-II, q. 106, a. 4.

12. F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti Lexicon graecum* ἰδοὺ; D. Palmieri, *Proleg. De Ecclesia* th.8, p.23; U. Holzmeister, *Dominus tecum*: VerDom 23 (1943) 232-237, 257-262.

the Holy Spirit, will be sent to bring to perfection the work of Christ" (Matt. 10:20; Luke 12:12).¹³

302. c) After these preliminary remarks, now we present our proof whereby the perpetuity of the Church is shown. According to the absolute promise of Christ, the Apostles, exercising the office conferred on them, are infallibly strengthened until the end of the world by the efficacious assistance of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. But the Apostles exercising the office conferred on them until the end of the world constitute the Church. Therefore the Church until the end of the world is infallibly strengthened by the efficacious assistance of God.

The major is clear from the explanation of the texts, which we gave above. For, that the promise of Christ has to do with the assistance of God that will continue until the end of the world is shown in the very meaning of the words of Christ. That the assistance is efficacious we conclude from the fact that Christ promised it as absolutely future and infallibly connected with events, as we pointed out in the explanation of the texts.

Furthermore, the concern is not with a promised reward, which supposes the merits of human actions or is dependent on them; rather, it has to do with the economy of salvation established by God absolutely and independently of man's merits. When God's decree is accomplished, the freedom of man cannot be an obstacle, since we know that God, while preserving the freedom of his creatures, can efficaciously obtain what he absolutely wants to take place.¹⁴

303. 3. *The Church either by death or by hostile powers cannot be overcome*, according to the absolute promise of Christ (Matt. 16:18).

a) *Concerning the text:* The words of Matt. *the Gates of Hell* (πύλαι ᾧδου) can signify either the power of death or the hostile powers of the devil.

In the O.T. *the Gates of Hell* and *the Gates of death* (πύλαι θανάτου) often are used as synonyms (see Isa. 38:10; Wis. 16:13; Job 38:17; Ps. 9:13; 107:18). J. Schmid holds that this is the only meaning of the expression.

In the N.T. *the Gates of Hell* can signify the hostile powers of the devil (see Matt. 7:24; 12:26; 13:39; Eph. 6:12-16). The words *they shall not prevail* seem to suppose rather these hostile powers (οὐ κατισχύσουσιν). This is the interpretation of Leo XIII (see n. 294). M. Meinertz thinks that both meanings are included.

Therefore, *the Gates of Hell* can signify either death or the hostile powers,

13. I. Knabenbauer, *Comment. in Evang. Io* 14:16-17, 26.

14. See G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.41 at the end.

not in the abstract, but in the concrete, namely, those that are described in the Gospels, or that fight against the Church and they never cease in their attack against her (see Matt. 5:11ff.44ff.; 10:16-31; John 15:20).

a) *Concerning the text*: The words of Matt. *against it* (*adversus eam*) can be understood either as against the Church or against the rock or against the Church and the rock together. On this point Origen said: "they will not prevail against it: but which "it"? Is it the rock on which Christ built his Church, or is it the Church? The expression is ambiguous. Is it the Church and the rock as one and the same thing? I think this is the true answer."¹⁵

304. c) Accordingly, now under the direction of Leo XIII, in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" (ASS 28,712), the argument is made both on the supposition that we refer the "it" to the Church, and if we supposed that the "it" refers to the rock.

If we refer the "it" to the Church, we are saying: According to the absolute promise of Christ, neither death nor the hostile powers will prevail against the Church. But this signifies that it will never happen that the Church built on Peter will fail or cease to exist. Therefore, according to the absolute promise of Christ the Church will never be overcome either by death or by hostile powers.

The major and the minor are clear from an analysis of the text and from the explanation preceding it.

If we refer the "it" to Peter, then in the text it must be understood about the rock in a reduplicative way as the foundation of the Church; having granted that, we say: According to the absolute promise of Christ, the Rock will never cease to be the foundation of the Church, in spite of all attacks coming either from death or hostile powers. Therefore the Church will never be overcome either by death or by hostile powers. The *antecedent* and the *consequent* from the preceding explanations are clear.

305. B) The same first part can also be proved by the argument that Leo XIII proposes in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" (ASS 28,712), from which the perpetuity of the Church is necessarily inferred, and it goes like this:

The mission of Christ is that all men are to be saved through him and only through him, as is clearly certain from John 3:13-18; Acts 4:12; 1 Tim. 2:3-6. But Christ handed over his mission to the Church, as is very clear from John 17:6-8.14.17-19; 20:21; Mark

15. Origen, *Comment. in Matt* t.12 n.11: GChS 40,1: MG 13,1004. See I. Knabenbauer, *Comment. In Matt* 16:18; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.6 scholium 2, On the Gates of Hell. S.Th., *In Symbolum* c.12: "The devil as a matter of principle works for the destruction of the Church, but he will not prevail, because the Lord said: The Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it (Matt. 16:18), as if he were to say: They will wage war against you, but they will not prevail." J. Schmid, *Das Evang. nach Matth* (1952) 198, holds that "the Gates of Hell" signify death. M. Meinertz, *Theol. des N.T.* 1 (1950) 75.

16:15f.; as we already proved in theses 2 and 3. Therefore the mission of the Church is that all men are to be saved through him and only through him. But in order that *all* can be saved only through the Church, it is necessary that the Church continue to exist perpetually until the end of the world. Therefore the Church is going to continue to exist necessarily and perpetually until the end of the world.¹⁶

306. Part 2: The Hierarchy in the Church necessarily will be perennial.

For the Hierarchy in the Church to be perennial, two things are required: 1) That the hierarchical *office itself* be perennial, that is, that the threefold power of teaching, sanctifying and governing, instituted by Christ, be perennial in the Church. 2) That the *hierarchical way of constituting the subject* of the office be perennial, that is, that the subject of the office is established by divine right, not by the community of the faithful nor by the secular powers, but by God or at least by other bishops. But both functions in the Church necessarily will be perennial. Therefore the Hierarchy in the Church necessarily will be perennial.

The major is evident from the notion itself of hierarchical power as was explained in thesis 3.

The minor must be proved as to both of its parts:

1) In the Church *the hierarchical office itself* necessarily will be perennial, because, according to the absolute promise of Christ, the powers instituted by himself are to be exercised perennially under the efficacious assistance of Christ and of the Holy Spirit in the Church; and this is to be done *forever, until the end of the world and until the Lord comes* to judge all men, as was explained in the preceding part (Matt. 28:18-20; John 14:16.26; 1 Cor. 11:24.26).

307. 2) In the Church also *the hierarchical way of constituting the subject of the office* necessarily will be perennial. For, what was divinely instituted by Christ or by divine right by the Apostles in the Church—that necessarily will be perennial in the Church. But what was divinely instituted by Christ or by divine right by the Apostles in the Church is that the subject of the office is established in a hierarchical way. Therefore, in the Church the hierarchical way of establishing the subject of the office necessarily will be perennial.

The major is clear: Because the divine law cannot be changed by

16. At Vatican Council I to some of the Fathers this argument seemed to be inefficacious: Msi 51,808f.812. You can find the testimonies of the Fathers about the perpetuity of the Church in A. Straub, *De Ecclesia*, n.397-399.

anyone; but the Church was founded completely by Christ with the Apostles, to whom the Lord handed over his whole mission, as is certain from thesis 3 about the institution of the Church. It can be further confirmed from Eph. 2:20; 3:5; Rev. 21:14: *Built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone...the Mystery of Christ, which was not made known to other generations, as it has now been revealed to his holy Apostles... And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.* Therefore whatever comes from the Apostles cannot be lacking to the Church, since they are its foundation.

308. The minor is proved, A. From the testimony of Christ.

It was divinely instituted in the Church by Christ that it might be constituted as the subject of the office in a hierarchical manner, because the first subject of ecclesiastical power was hierarchically constituted by Christ himself, as is abundantly clear from the theses on the institution of *the College of Apostles* and *the apostolic Primacy*, and as the Princes of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, expressly bear witness to (Acts 10:40-42; 2 Cor. 5:18-20).

309. The minor is proved, B. From the testimony of the Apostles.

By divine right from the Apostles it was instituted in the Church so that the subject of the office might be constituted in a hierarchical manner. For

St. Paul	{ 1) <i>in a hierarchical manner</i> : Acts 14:23; 1 Tim.4:11; Tit. 1:5f. { 2) <i>by divine right</i> : Acts 20:28; 2 Tim. 1:6-9.14 Tit.1:7	} teaches
----------	--	-----------

that the subject of office in the Church is constituted by the Apostles: 1) *In a hierarchical manner*, because in the cited places the constitution of some subject in an office expressly is said to be made by the hierarchs. 2) *By divine right*: a) because in Acts 20:28, those who had been established in office by the Apostles, are said *to have been placed by the Holy Spirit*; b) because in 2 Tim. 1:6-9, through that imposition of hands, by which the Apostles constituted others in an office, *the grace of God was given* and the Spirit of power whom God gave was received; c) because, finally, in Tit. 1:7, those who are constituted in office by the hierarchs are called *God's stewards* (οἰκονόμοι), that is, those whom God has chosen as administrators of his family and house.¹⁷

310. The minor is proved, C. From the testimony of the ancient Church.

It was instituted in the Church with divine power by Christ or by divine

17. See I. Knabenbauer and other commentators on the words of Scripture quoted here.

right by the Apostles so that it would be constituted as the subject of the office in a hierarchical manner. This assertion can be proved abundantly from the unanimous testimony of the holy Fathers.¹⁸ It will be sufficient for our purpose to cite some very ancient and illustrious testimonies.

St. Clement of Rome (ca. 96) openly defends this teaching (R 19, 20, 21).

St. Ignatius the Martyr in his letters (ca. 107) says: "Whoever is sent by the father of the family to govern his family—him we must accept as if he were the one who sent him. Therefore, it is manifest that it is necessary to accept the Bishop as the Lord himself"; and so he exhorts the faithful that they should be "united with the Bishop and priests and deacons designated according to the plan of Christ, whom according to his own will he confirmed in stability through his Holy Spirit."¹⁹ According to these very clear statements of St. Ignatius, now the other not less clear views of the same holy Father can be fully understood (R 44, 48, 49, 65 etc.; see also St. Irenaeus R 237).

311. Part three: The Primacy in the perennial Church from the will of Christ necessarily will be perennial. N.B. The arguments suppose the perpetuity of the Church as already proved, as we have demonstrated it in part 1.

It is proved 1) from the nature of the Primacy. According to the will of Christ the Primacy is the foundation of the perennial Church (Matt. 16:18). But the Church cannot be perennial unless its foundation is also perennial, as is evident. Therefore, the Primacy in the perennial Church is necessarily perennial.

It is proved 2) from the universality of the Primacy. According to the will of Christ the Primacy is the office of feeding the universal flock of Christ's faithful (John 21:15-17). Therefore it will continue to exist as long as the needy flock exists. But the flock of Christ, that is the Church, necessarily will be perennial, as we proved in part 1 (see also if you wish 1 Cor. 5:14f.; 1 Tim. 2:4; 4:10). Therefore the Primacy in the perennial Church by the will of Christ necessarily will be perennial.

312. It is proved 3) from the purpose of the Primacy. According to the will of Christ the purpose of the Primacy is the same as that which is proper to any supreme social authority, that is, to bring about and to preserve the unity of the Church (see John 10:16 *and there shall be one flock, one Shepherd*).²⁰ But the unity of the Church necessarily is perennial,

18. See A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* th.13.

19. F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* 1,219-265.

20. See Vatican Council I, D 3050-3052; Pius IX, D 2886-2888; Leo XIII, ASS 28,733f.

because it was sought from God eagerly and by the efficacious prayer of Christ (John 17:11.20f.). Therefore, the Primacy in the perennial Church by the will of Christ necessarily is perennial.

It is confirmed 4) by Leo I, who at the Council of Ephesus through his Legate said: "Peter even to this time and forever lives in his successors and exercises judgment" (D 3056). St. Thomas said brilliantly: "the power of Christ was given to his disciples for building up the Church... Therefore it is necessary for it to last as long as it is necessary to build up the Church. But this is... until the end of the world."²¹

313. Scholium 1. Several authors present an argument from the prophecies of the O.T. to prove the perpetuity of the Church.²² M. D'Herbigny thinks that by this argument the perpetuity is only suggested; Dorsch points out that he is using the dogmatic method in proposing such an argument; Van Laak offer it only in a dogmatic treatise²³; finally, several authors simply omit it.²⁴ Therefore among all of them there is no certainty about the apologetic value of the argument from the O.T. See what is said about this in Lercher and Zapelena.²⁵

314. Scholium. 2. The expectation of **Millennarism** or Chiliasm. A rather crude Millennarism or Millennial Kingdom abounding in sensible pleasures was defended towards the end of the first century by Cerinthus, and then later during the last third of the 2nd century by Montanus and the Montanists.²⁶ Notable opponents of this Millennarism were, at the beginning of the 3rd century the priest Caius, and during that same century the Alexandrians Origen and Dionysius.²⁷ Led however, especially by Rev. 20:1-10, several ancient ecclesiastical authors admitted a certain earthly Millennarism; among them was St. Justin, who said, "that there are many from that group of Christians, which followed a pious and pure opinion, who did not acknowledge it, as I pointed out to you."²⁸ Later St. Jerome, while attacking the fictions of Millennarism, said: "we are not allowed to follow this, but we cannot condemn it because many ecclesiastical men and martyrs did say such things."²⁹

21. S.Th., 4 CG 74.

22. Franzelin, 66; Palmieri, 22; De Groot, 271; Mazzella, n.747; Wilmers, n.41; Muncunill, n.277; Straub, n.391; De San, n.217; Van Noort, n.21; Pesch, *Praelect.* N.313; Id., *Compend.* I n.221; Felder, 25; De Guibert, n.90; Brunsmann, 110; Specht, 320; Paris, 119; Schill, 286; Tournely, 1,255; Lercher, n.308.

23. M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.56; E. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 65; Van Laak, *De Ecclesia tract. Dogm.* 251.

24. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* 210; Ottiger, 274-358; Dieckmann, n.378; Schultes, 277; Michelitsch, n.177; Gutberlet, 45; Zubizarreta, n.470; Dublanchy omits the argument from the O.T both in the apologetic treatise and in the dogmatic one on the Church; *Eglise*: DTC 2117.2145.

25. Lercher, ed. 1 n.327; ed.4 n.308; Zapelena (1950) p.158.

26. See Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 3,28; 5,3.16-19; 7,25; MG 20,273f.437-481.697. See J. Tixeront, *Hist. des Dogm* 1 c.4 § 7; I.B. Franzelin, *De divina Traditione* th.16; Id., *De Ecclesia*, th.19 Scholium; G. Bardy, *Millennarisme*: DTC 10,1760.

27. Origen, *De Principiis* 1.2 c.11: MG 11,241-248. See Euseb., *Hist. eccles.* 3,28; 7,24-25: MG 20,273f.692-704.

28. St. Justin, *Dialog. cum Triph* n.80f.: MG 6,664-669. See C. Morrondo, *Estudios Biblico-Milenarios* (Jaén 1922) (he defends spiritual Millennarism).

29. St. Jerome, *Comment. in Jer* 19,10: ML 24,802 (R 1407).

319. Therefore from these testimonies of St. Justin, about 155, and of St. Jerome, about 420, it is certain that several ecclesiastical authors always opposed Millenarism, but not a few also admitted it. Moreover, towards the end of the first century Millenarism was held by the author of the Barnabas Letter³⁰; in the 2nd century Papias (R 658), St. Justin,³¹ St. Irenaeus (R 260); in the third century Tertullian (R 338), St. Hippolytus,³² Nepos an Alexandrian Bishop,³³ Commodianus,³⁴ Victorinus Petavionensis³⁵; in the 4th century St. Methodius Olympos,³⁶ Lactantius (R 647), Apollinaris of Laodicea,³⁷ Ambrosiaster,³⁸ and St. Ambrose?³⁹; finally, in the 5th century Sulpicius Severus,⁴⁰ St. Augustine junior (R 1521), who however later retracted this opinion and he proposed an explanation of Rev. 20:1-6, which after that became common (R 1768, 1769). These remarks about Christian Millenarism in the age of the Fathers will suffice.⁴¹

316. Since the middle of the 5th century only rarely are some Catholic authors mentioned, who have defended a very mitigated form of Millenarism or at least have looked upon it with some benevolence, as for example in our time M. Chasles and those whom he cites.⁴² The Church has not yet definitively condemned Millenarism of this kind. But already in 1941 the *Holy Office* declared: "Mitigated Millenarism cannot be taught safely" (D 3839).

317. The first Protestants were not guilty of this error. But among the illuminist sects of Protestants several are mentioned which defended Schatologism and Millenarism: the so-called Neo-Apostolic Community, Mormons, Adventists, Russellians or Millenarists, Anabaptists, and others.⁴³ The Jews were expecting a happy Millennial Messianic Kingdom; these fictions seem to have exercised a certain influence on Christian Millenarists.⁴⁴

30. St. Barnabas, *Epist.* 15,4-9; F.X. Funk, *PP. Apostolici* 1,83-85.

31. St. Justin, *loc.cit.*, in note 27.

32. St. Hippolytus, *Comment. in Dan* 4,23; ed Bonwetsch-Achelis: GChS 1,240.

33. See Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 7,24; MG 20,292f. (R 2226).

34. Commodianus, *Instruct.* L.2 c.3 and 39: CSEL 15, p. 63 and 110.

35. Victorinus, *Comment. in Apoc* 20: ed. Hausleiter: CSEL 49,138-144. See S. Jerome, *De viris illustr.* 18:ML 23,615.

36. St. Methodius, *Convivium 10 virginum* 9,5: MG 18,189.

37. See St. Basil, *Epist.* 263 n.4: MG 32,980.

38. Ambrosiaster, *Comment. in 1 Cor* 15,52: ML 17,268.

39. St. Ambrose, *Ennarat. In Ps* 1 n.54: ML 14,948.

40. Suloicius Sev., *Dialog.* 2,14: CSEL 1,197; see ML 20,211.

41. G. Bardy, *Millénarisme*: DTC 10,1760-1763; F. Alcañiz, *Ecclesia Patristica et Millenarismus* (1933) (he favors Millenarism).

42. M. Chasles, *Celui qui revient* (1936) 237-249; J. Ramos, *Summa Isagogico-Exegetica in lib.N.T.* (Rome 1940) v.2 340-377.

43. See C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa e le Chiese* (1944) 679-692.731.

44. On the Millenarism of the Messianic Kingdom invented by the Jews and on its influence on the Millenarism of Christians, see H. Lesetre, *Millénarisme*: DB 4,1090-1097; E.B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse* (1933) in *Apoc.* 20,1-10, p.307-329; A. Gelin, *Apocalypse* (1936) in *Apoc.* 20,1-6: in L. Pirop, *La Sa.Bible* t.12,656-658; A. Piolanti, *De Novissimis* (1947) gives a brief historical overview and bibliography, p.118-122; G. Bardy, *Millénarisme*: DTC 10,1759-63; J. Bonsirven, *L'Apocalypse* (Verbum salutis 16) (1951) 287-299; J.F. Sagüés, *De novissimis*: SThS 4 (1953) n.324-334.

318. Objections.⁴⁵ 1. The perpetuity of the Church depends on the free will of God, who can decide on another economy of salvation which would replace the Church. Therefore the perpetuity of the Church cannot be said to be necessary.

I distinguish the antecedent. God could have decided on another economy of salvation which would replace the Church antecedently to the decree by which he freely established that the Church should not be replaced by another economy, *conceded*; subsequent to the decree of God, *denied*.

2. The perpetuity of the Church depends on the free cooperation of men (Rom. 11:22). But the free cooperation of men is changeable. Therefore the Church is changeable.

I distinguish the major. The perpetuity of the Church depends on the free cooperation of men under the efficacious providence of God, *conceded*; on an efficacious providence independent of God, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.* The free cooperation of men is changeable in individuals succeeding each other, *conceded*; in all their acts taken together, *I subdistinguish*: if it is independent of the efficacious providence of God, *conceded*; under the efficacious assistance of God which, while preserving human freedom, can easily obtain the established end, *denied*.

320. 3. Rom. 6:9: *Death no longer has power over him* means concerning Christ that, after his resurrection from the dead, death will not have any power over him. Similarly, in Matt. 16:18: *And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it* means concerning Peter that, after his resurrection from the dead, death will not have any power over him. Therefore with these words nothing is said about the perpetuity of the Church.

I deny the parity of the antecedent and the interpretation of Matt. 16:18, because in this place the words do not refer to the death and resurrection of Peter.

321. 4. Matt. 16:18 signifies only the perpetuity of resistance, that is, that the Church will not be overcome or suppressed by hostile powers, but it does not signify the perpetuity of existence, that is, that the Church is not going to be replaced by some other economy of salvation. Therefore Matt. 16:18 does not prove that the Church is going to continue to exist until the end of the world.⁴⁶

I distinguish the antecedent. Matt. 16:18 signifies only the perpetuity of resistance if "the gates of hell" are interpreted to be about death, *denied*; if "the gates of hell" are interpreted to be about powerful enemies, *I subdistinguish*: if Matt. 16:18 is taken in the abstract separated from the proximate and remote context of St. Matthew's Gospel, *I bypass that*; if it is taken in the concrete or in the context of St. Matthew's Gospel, where the attacks are foretold which the Church will suffer constantly until the end of the world, *denied* (see Matt. 5:11f.44f.; 10:16-39; 24:9-14; John 15:18-21; 16:1-4).

322. 5. The given arguments prove only a perpetuity of fact. Therefore, at least the Church's perpetuity of right is not proved.

I distinguish the antecedent. The arguments prove only a perpetuity of fact based

45. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.6; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1921) 214-217.228.254-265.

46. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.380.

on the efficacious assistance of God, *conceded*; they prove a perpetuity only of fact not based on the assistance of God, which renders the defection of the Church impossible, *denied*.

323. 6. The promise of perpetuity, founded on the efficacious assistance of God, was made by God to the Old Testament (Ps. 105:8-10; 111:5-9; Isa. 49:14-16). But the Old Testament was transformed substantially into a better economy. Therefore the promise of perpetuity founded on the efficacious assistance of God does not render impossible at least a substantial transformation of the Church into a better economy.

I distinguish the major. The promise of perpetuity was made by God to the O.T. by reason of the N.T., for which the O.T. was a preparation and type, *conceded*; by reason of itself, *denied*. For, by reason of itself the O.T., as the preparation and type of the N.T., was essentially transitory as was shown in thesis 1, n.84-87. *I concede the minor and distinguish the consequent.* The promise of perpetuity does not render impossible the substantial transformation of the Church into another better economy, if the promise were made to the Church, not by reason of itself, but by reason of another temporal economy, of which the Church would be the preparation and type, *conceded*; if the promise is made to the Church by reason of itself and in order only for a triumphant Church in heaven, of which the Church militant can be said to be the preparation and type, *denied*.

324. 7. Luke 18:8: *When the Son of man comes, will he find faith on earth?* Therefore the Church will cease to exist before the end of the world.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the quoted words the concern is about a loss of theological faith and consequently about the failure of the Church, *denied*; the concern is with a loss of faith, which should accompany prayer, *I subdistinguish*: the concern is with a great decline in faith, *conceded*; the concern is with a total loss of it, *denied*. This indeterminate expression, made in the form of a question, should be interpreted according to the positive statements of Christ himself: Matt. 24:10-13.⁴⁷

325. 8. In Rev. 13:3-8 it is foretold that the Church is going to fail completely.⁴⁸

I distinguish. In the cited text the times of the Roman Empire are being foretold and other situations of the same kind, in which Christ's faithful are attacked by great persecutions and a large part of men lead a life turned away from the true worship of God, *conceded*; the total failure of the Church of Christ is being foretold, *denied*.

326. 9. Rev. 20:1-6. After the Christian economy and before the final judgment, an intermediate, happy millenarian economy is announced, in which the just will reign with Christ for a thousand years. Therefore the Church will not continue to exist until the final judgment.

Response. The millenarian economy, which is being announced, is nothing other

47. See Van Laak, *De Ecclesia tractatus dogmaticus* 269, where various interpretation of Luke 18:8 are given.

48. See E.B.Allo, *L'Apocalypse* (1933) at Rev. 13:3-8.

than the Church militant itself, according to the explanation of St. Augustine, which Catholic authors commonly propose as more true, opposed to the other one which some of the holy Fathers and St. Augustine himself previously had held (R 1768, 1769; see R 1521 and the theological Index, n.604).⁴⁹

327. 10. St. Paul (1 Tim. 3:7), St. Clement of Rome (R 21), St. Cyprian (R 588) testify that the subject of an office was constituted democratically. Therefore the hierarchical manner of the constitution of the subject of an office is not perennial.

I distinguish the antecedent. The cited authors testify that the testimony of the faithful was sought concerning the life and morals of the one who was to be constituted in the office, *conceded*; they testify that someone was constituted in office by the faithful themselves, *denied*.

328. 11. It is unfitting for the wisdom of God that a universal religious society should be placed in the hands of one man, and that a society of men should be constituted under one unchangeable form of government.

I distinguish the antecedent. It is unfitting for the wisdom of God that a universal religious society should be placed in the hands of one man left to his own human powers, and that a society of men should be constituted under one unchangeable form of government that does not know how to adapt itself to the various circumstances of times, *conceded*; it is unfitting for the wisdom of God to place a universal religious society in the hands of one man helped by efficacious divine assistance, and to constitute a society of men under one unchangeable form of government, which he foresees will be adapted to the various circumstance of times, *denied*.

329. 12. The Primacy is a personal reward for the faith of Peter and a privilege of the personal Apostolate of Peter. But a personal reward and a privilege granted to a person die with that person. Therefore, the Primacy given to Peter is not perennial.⁵⁰

I distinguish the major. It is a reward and privilege for the person of Peter that he was chosen by Christ before others to be the first to exercise the office of the Primacy, *conceded*; the office itself of the Primacy is merely a reward and privilege for the person of Peter, *denied*.

49. See concerning this thesis, scholium 2 n.314-317.

50. Luther argued with this reason, *De potestate Papae*: ed. Weimar, t.2 p.191-197; Calvin, *Harmonia evangelica* to Matt. 16:19; *Corpus Reformatorum* 73, p.477. Likewise in our time, O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) 192-214, see below n.458.

ARTICLE II

BISHOPS ARE SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES

Thesis 8. Bishops by divine right succeed the Apostles in their ordinary office; each one of them presides over one particular Church.

330. S.Th. II-II, q. 184, a. 6 ad 1; q. 185, a. 1-8; III, q. 72, a. 11; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.9 n.10; *Defensio fidei* l.3 c.11 n.12; c.12 n.9; c.10 n.6; D. Petavius, *De ecclesiastica Hierarchia: Dogmata theologica* (1870) v.8 p.97-405; A. Michiels, *Evêques*: DAFC 1,1750-1786; F. Prat, *Evêques*: DTC 5,1656-1701; L. Marchall, *Evêques*: DBS a (1934) 1297-1333; G. Wilmers, th.50-53; D. Palmieri, *Proleg. De Ecclesia* th.17; L. Billot, q.15; J. Muncunill, n.547; M. D'Herbigny, n.357; H. Dieckmann, n.457; Ae. Dorsch, p.94; L. Lercher, th.32; T. Zapele-na, th.14; E. Ruffini, *La Gerarchia della Chiesa* (Rome 1921); A. Michiels, *L'origine de L'Episcopat* (1900); J. Colson, *L'Evêque dans les communautés primitives* (1951); A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* c.1 q.2.

331. Connection. We have proved that the Hierarchy in the Church is perennial. Now we ask further concerning the subject who obtains hierarchical power in the Church after the Apostles.

332. Definition of terms. The *Apostles* are those Twelve disciples of Christ with whom the Lord instituted the College.

The *office of Apostles* in general is the complex of all the powers, which for the good of the Church were conferred on them by Christ.

Their *ordinary* office is the complex of the powers of teaching, sanctifying and governing, which are firmly connected to the institution itself as a permanent office.

An *extraordinary* office is a complex of powers, which are committed to someone for extraordinary events or circumstances.

A *delegated* office is a complex of powers, which are committed to a person, from among those contained in some ordinary office.

333. Therefore, an *ordinary* office differs from an *extraordinary* one, because the ordinary office is granted for all generally occurring situations, but the extraordinary if for some unusual happenings and circumstances.

But an *ordinary* office differs from a *delegated* one, because the ordinary is annexed to an office, but the delegated is granted to a person.¹

Moreover, an *office* can be *proper* or *vicarious*, according as it is exercised by the subject in his own name and right, or in the name and right of another person, to whom the office properly belongs.²

1. See Th. Grandmaison, *Constitutiones Dogmaticae Conc. Vaticani I* part 2, Const. de Ecclesia, c.2 n.2 p.221; L. Rodrigo, *Praelectiones Theologico-morales* (1944) 2 n.47-50.

2. See Th.6, *De Christi in terris Vicario*.

334. We understand to succeed “by divine right” in the sense in which it was understood by Vatican Council I, that is, “according to the institution of Christ our Lord himself” (D 3058).³ But this implies especially two things: 1) *objectively*, that the office itself was instituted positively by God; 2) *subjectively*, that the person occupying the office obtained it according to the law established *positively by God* for its conferral. Hence this office was not only in itself divinely instituted, but also it is conferred on the subject divinely or according to the divine positive law. Accordingly, the one who obtains the office possesses and exercises it with regard to men as *something proper to himself*, not as taking the place or office of some other human person.

Succession is the continuation of one person after another in some office. A twofold *succession* should be distinguished, one material and the other formal: a) *Material succession* is a mere temporal continuation of one person after another in some office. b) *Formal succession* is the full substitution of one person in the rights and obligations of an office for someone else, or it is the substitution of a subject without any change of right in a certain office.

335. The word *Bishop*, etymologically from ἐπισκέπτομαι, is the same thing as overseer or prefect. This word in profane literature, in the Greek translation of the O.T. and in the inspired books of the N.T. signifies at least a firmly established office, especially one concerning holy things.⁴

A *Bishop* in our thesis is understood as a man who in a particular Church has the complete ordinary power of teaching, sanctifying and governing. Therefore, the power of the Bishop is not merely delegated or extraordinary or vicarious coming from some other human person, although it is the power of a Bishop “placed under the due authority of the Roman Pontiff,” who not in his own name, “but in the name of Christ feeds and governs his flock.”⁵

Bishops, who as individuals preside over particular Churches, exclude a collegial Episcopate, and therefore they can be said to be *Monarchs*, although they may have under them other Bishops as *auxiliaries* or *coadjutors*.

3. See Th. Granderath, *loc. cit.*, p. 142-150.

4. U. Holzmeister, *Si quis Episcopatum desiderat*: Bibl 12 (1931) 41-69.

5. Pius XII, Encyclical “*Mystici Corporis*”: AAS 35,211f.

336. State of the question. We are saying 1) that it is a matter of divine right that the College of Bishops formally succeeds the College of the Apostles; 2) that the individual Bishops govern monarchically the individual Churches with a power that is complete in its own kind; but we are also saying that this monarchical nature of the Episcopate can be suitably explained only because of its divine institution.

337. Adversaries. 1) All those who either have worked against the obedience due to Bishops and their freedom, or have exalted the rights of the secular authority over the legitimate power of the Church and of the Bishops, or at least have held that priests are equal in authority with the Bishops. Adversaries of this kind in the 4th century were Arius (D 2609), in the 14th century Marsilius of Padua (D 1498 [34th ed.]), in the 15th century Wycliffe and Hus (D 1265); since the 16th century the followers of Calvin and *Presbyterian Protestants* (D 2609), in the 17th century E. Richer and his disciples, who were joined by the followers of the *Synod of Pistoia* in the 18th and 19th centuries (D 2609-2611).

338. 2) Since the middle of the 19th century the form critics; *Rationalists* and *Evolutionists* are of one mind, while they deny that all external organization of the Church and succession of the Apostles is of divine right. They hold that it is of the essence of the Church only that those things are from the will of Christ that are merely internal, spiritual and religious; they say that everything else is merely a human invention, since they were added by men and arose because of the influence of various causes, either internal or external. And so they explain the merely human origin of the Episcopacy in the following manner:

339. a) Up until the year 1880 they said: In the first letters of St. Paul the *particular Churches* seem to be *democratic* (1 Cor. 13:26-35); then in imitation of the Jews and Hellenists, a *Council of Elders* was introduced to direct in an orderly way the meetings of the faithful; the *Presider* of these Elders gradually obtained more authority for himself and established his own ministers or *Deacons*, and governed the particular Church as a *Bishop*. In this way the *Episcopacy* first appeared after the middle of the 2nd century. Finally, out of a confederation of these ordered particular Churches the universal Church was born at the beginning of the 3rd century.⁶ Since this

6. Fr. Schleiermacher, *Der christliche Glaube* (1836) § 115; F.C. Baur, *Über den Ursprung des Episcopats* (1838); J.B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians* (1878). See O. Linton, *Das Problem der Urkirche* (1932) 3-67.

theory cannot be reconciled with the clear teaching of the letters, which St. Ignatius wrote about the year 107, and since it contradicts the explicit testimonies of the pastoral letters, which St. Paul wrote before the year 67, its advocates have tried to show that these letters of SS. Paul and Ignatius are not genuine.⁷ But they were not able to prove this in a convincing way; therefore they contrived another theory, which follows.

340. b) After the year 1880 Hatch changed the theory of his predecessors only in the fact that he supposed that the particular communities of the faithful, right from the beginning, instituted two classes of directors, in imitation of the Jews and Hellenists; one of *Priests*, to the College of which they committed the care of discipline and the administration of justice, but the other of *Bishops with their Deacons*, to whom they handed over the administration of charitable works and also the unity and the order of worship. From this very early merely ministerial function gradually a transition was made to the *monarchical authority of the Bishop* in the particular Churches; from the confederation of these at the beginning of the 3rd century the universal Church took its origin. Harnack embraced this theory and afterwards, relying on the testimonies of the *Didache* (Kch 4.6), he completed it. For, to the two classes of leaders, to the patriarchal one of the Priests and to the administrative one of the Bishops, he added a spiritual or *charismatic* class, namely, of *Apostles, Prophets and Doctors*, which did not belong to any particular Church and took precedence in dignity over the other two classes of the particular Churches. However, the authority of the *Bishop* gradually increased to such an extent that towards the end of the 2nd century he obtained full power everywhere.⁸

341. c) Meanwhile Sohm, the principal author of the *charismatic theory*, relying on the narration of St. Paul (1 Cor. 14), stated that the Churches were only eucharistic gatherings of the faithful ordered and directed by the charismatics or by those whom the charismatics designated for that work; *but that the idea of a right of succession contradicted the very essence of Christianity*. He thought that this was first devised in Rome; that at the end of the first century there was a firm and immutable law of the Episcopacy; that at the beginning of the 2nd century there was a monarchical Episcopacy; that after the middle of the 2nd century the right of episcopal succession was

7. F.C. Baur, *loc.cit.*, 61-73, 148-185; Id., *Die Ignatianischen Briefe* (1848); J.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers* 2, S. Ignatius (1885); H.J. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (1880); E. Kühl, *Die Gemeindeordnung in den Pastoralbriefen* (1885).

8. E. Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (1882); A. Harnack, *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen* (1883); Id., *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel*: TU 2 (1884).

attributed to the Apostles. Therefore, the juridical episcopacy, according to Sohm, was created in Rome and by the Roman Bishops was introduced into all the Churches of Christ.⁹

342. d) Contemporary critical Rationalists have added nothing new, but from the preceding theories individual authors have borrowed what seems to them to be more probable. Unanimously they assert that the *divine law* and hierarchical authority are restricted exclusively to the times of the Apostles and the charismatics. All other ministers of the Churches are of *merely human origin*, as delegates of the communities in order to carry out religious service. "The Church of the Reformation," says Schmidt, "according to its principles recognizes no apostolic succession, and therefore in no way can it give assent to the Catholic assertion: that the ministry of the Church was instituted not only by Christ, but also handed down by succession, or in the way established by Christ. But Barth logically infers from his teaching on the Church (n.127 d): "that there is in the Church no *Hierarchy*, or offices, or any ecclesiastical functions. The systems of an *episcopal*, *presbyteral*, etc. constitution are more damaging than helpful for the *free* preaching of the word of God in a *free and living* Congregation of the living Christ, which is the Church." But Goguel explains the origin of the episcopacy in a way that is very close to the teaching invented by Harnack. According to Cullmann, the function of the Apostles is a historical event that is foundational and unique, and one which in the proper sense cannot be handed down by succession.¹⁰

343. 3) In the 20th century the *Eschatologists* and *Modernists* are also opposed. The *Eschatologists* reject the divine right of the Episcopacy and hold that Christ thought only about the imminent end of the world. But the *Modernists* think that succession is impossible, since they teach that everything in the Church takes its origin from religious consciousness, which spontaneously suggests the things that are adapted to the individual ages and conditions of the times (D 3450, 3492).¹¹

9. R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht* I (1892) 379-380; Id., *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholicismus* (1909). A.M. Javierre has collected the theories of Protestants opposing succession: *Sucesión Apostólica*: Salesianum 16 (1954) 77-108.

10. K.L. Schmidt, *Le Ministère et les ministères dans l'Eglise du N.T.*: *RevHistPhRel* 18 (1937) 315-336; G. Gloege, *Reich Gottes und Kirche im N.T.* (1929); H.D. Wendland, *Die Eschatologie des Reiches Gottes* (1931). See F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 159-92; K. Barth, *L'Eglise, Congrégation vivante de J.Ch.* loc.cit., n.127 p.103f.106; M. Goguel, *Les premiers temps de l'Eglise* (1949) p.122-124, 165-173; O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) 182-214.

11. See in thesis 1, n.41, the teaching and supporters of the Eschatologists.

344. Doctrine of the Church. Now it can be inferred from the cited condemnations of the adversaries; but in addition it is contained especially in Vatican Council I sess.4: *The Episcopate* at least *implicitly* is taught to be of divine right (D 3050). It is defined further that Bishops are successors of the Apostles by divine institution in their ordinary power of jurisdiction (D 3061). It is also defined that the individual Bishops are the true pastors of the particular Churches, but it is not certain whether or not this *monarchical* character is defined to be of divine right. And this is not found to be clearer in CIC 329 [1917].¹²

345. *The Council of Trent*, dealing with priestly power (D 1764) defined that the Hierarchy (D 1776) is of divine right and that the Bishops, successors of the Apostles, pertain to it (D 1767). In CIC 108 [1917] we read: "By divine institution the holy hierarchy by reason of Orders consists of Bishops, Priests and ministers; by reason of jurisdiction, of a supreme Pontificate and a subordinate Episcopate."

Leo XIII in the Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" clearly teaches the same doctrine: "He who made Peter the foundation of the Church also *chose the twelve, whom he called apostles* (Luke 6:13). Just as it is necessary that the authority of Peter should be perpetuated in the Roman Pontiff, so, by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they *inherit their ordinary power*, and thus the episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be considered as *vicars* of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule" (ASS 28,732). Read also D 3310.

Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*": the particular Churches "of which the one Catholic Church is composed; for these also are governed by Jesus Christ through the voice and authority of their respective Bishops. Therefore each Bishop is... so far as his own diocese is concerned, a true Pastor who tends and rules *in the name of Christ* the flock committed to his care (D 3061). In discharging this function, however, they are not completely independent but are subject to the proper authority of the Roman Pontiff, although they enjoy *ordinary* power of jurisdiction received directly from the Sovereign Pontiff himself. The people must therefore venerate them as successors of the Apostles *by divine institution*" (ASS 35,211f.). And see the Allocution, "*Si diligis*": AAS 46 (1954) 314.

346. Theological note. *Part I was defined* at the Council of Trent and

12. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.358, on the doctrine of the Council of Trent and of Vatican I. Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* I p.601-614, thinks that some authors do not speak correctly about double Hierarchy; but that there is in the Church one Hierarchy, which by reason of Orders has a triple grade of divine right, but by reason of jurisdiction a twofold grade (CIC 107-109 [1917]).

Vatican I (D 1767, 1776, 3061), in which it is defined that the Bishops of the particular Churches are by divine right successors of the Apostles. *Part II*, in which we hold that it is of divine institution that individual Bishops preside over the individual Churches, is *a certain conclusion in theology*, according to the proof of the second part.

347. Part I: The Bishops by divine right succeed the Apostles in their ordinary office.

Proof. 1) *as a conclusion of the preceding thesis.*

For, the hierarchy, instituted in the Apostles, by the will of Christ or by divine right is perennial. Therefore they always existed who, by divine right, fully succeeded the Apostles in their ordinary office. But only the Bishops *de facto* always fully succeeded the Apostles in their ordinary office. Therefore the Bishops by divine right succeed the Apostles in their ordinary office.

The antecedent and the first conclusion are certain from the preceding thesis, in which we proved the perpetuity of the hierarchy from the institution of Christ or by divine right.

The minor states a fact, which is clearly apparent from the history of the Church. But the same fact is proved from the arguments to be offered in proof of the second part.

348. Proof 2) *from the words of Christ.*

For, Christ committed to the same Apostles the ordinary office of teaching, sanctifying and ruling, and he did it perpetually *to the close of the age* (Matt. 28:20), universally *for all nations* (Matt. 28:18; Mark 16:150, in all places *to the end of the earth* (Acts 1:8). But Christ could not hand over such a mission *to the Apostles alone personally*, since they were going to die (John 21:19). Therefore, he conferred it on the same Apostles *morally and juridically*, that is, on their successors without any juridical change. But only the Bishops under the Roman Pontiff have always claimed for themselves and *de facto* have fully exercised the ordinary office of the Apostles accepted from them by succession. Therefore, from the words of Christ it is concluded that the Bishops are by divine right successors of the Apostles in their ordinary office.

349. Proof 3) *from the pastoral letter of St. Paul.*

Note what St. Thomas wisely points out about these letters: "Their matter is for the instruction of the directors of a faithful people, in which they are to be outstanding in spiritual things, like Overseers of the Church." And in particular on 1 Tim. he says:

“This letter is like a pastoral rule, which the Apostle hands over to Timothy, instructing him on everything that concerns the governance of Overseers” (*In 1 Tim.*, prolog. and ch. 1, lect.2).

In these letters St. Timothy at Ephesus and St. Titus on Crete are shown: a) taking the place of St. Paul himself or at least going to take it after his death, b) have total care of those Churches over all the faithful, c) and as placed there with authority received from God. But such men we call Bishops, successors of the Apostles, in their ordinary office and also by divine right. Therefore from these letters of St. Paul we deduce that the Bishops are the successors of the Apostles in their ordinary office and also by divine right.

The minor is clear from the notions themselves.

350. *The major* is proved by parts:

a) Timothy and Titus are presented *as taking the place itself of St. Paul*; for, the Apostle says: *I hope to come to you soon, but I am writing these instructions to you so that, if I am delayed, you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the Church of the living God.* And after he has instructed him in particular about many things, he adds: *In the presence of God I charge you... to keep these rules without favor, doing nothing from partiality* (1 Tim. 3:14f.; 5:21). Indeed, he confers on him the power of appointing elders of the Churches, saying: *appoint elders in every town as I directed you* (Tit. 1:5; 1 Tim. 5:22; 2 Tim. 2:2). Therefore the Apostle commends to Timothy and Titus that they simply take his place in the Church, doing nothing other than what he directed them to do, and to do it with full power to appoint elders of the Churches, which was especially the proper office of the Apostles (Acts 14:22f.).

These actions are commended by the Apostle to Timothy and Titus, either *as ordinary and proper pastors* of those Churches, or at least *as pastors who would succeed him in his ordinary office after the death of Paul*. For, he is instructing them, knowing that his death is near or *the time of his departure has come* (2 Tim. 4:5-8), concerning the things to be observed *until the appearing of the Lord* (1 Tim. 6:14), and in particular concerning the reason why they should constantly take care in appointing their successors (2 Tim. 2:2; Tit. 1:5).

351. b) *They are shown as having been put in place for the total care of the Churches of Ephesus and Crete.* For, he commends to them the care of the teaching, worship and governance of those Churches, and they are to do it with authority over all the other faithful.

Care of the teaching is commended with these words: *Command and teach these things... attend to the public reading, preaching and teaching... practice these duties... putting these instructions before the brethren, you will be a good minister of Christ Jesus, nourished on the words of the faith and of the good doctrine which you have followed* (1 Tim. 4:6.11.13.16). Similar things he commends again (1 Tim. 6:3.20; 2 Tim. 3:14-17), and finally he adds: *I charge you in the presence of God and of Christ Jesus who is to judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom:*

preach the word, be urgent in season and out of season, convince, rebuke, and exhort, be unfailing in patience and in teaching (2 Tim. 4:1f.). That was for Timothy. And to Titus he recommends the same care, saying: *But as for you, teach what befits sound doctrine... Declare these things; exhort and reprove with all authority* (Tit. 2:1.7f. 15). The preaching of doctrine was considered as an especially appropriate work of the Apostles themselves (Acts 6:2ff.; 1 Cor. 1:17; 1 Tim. 2:7; 2 Tim. 1:11).

Care of the worship. For, the Apostle carefully prescribes the way of offering prayers in the Church, which he commends to Timothy, when he says: *First of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all men, for kings and all who are in high positions... this is good and it is acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, who desires all men to be saved... I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling; also the women should adorn themselves modestly... as befits women who profess religion* (1 Tim. 2:1-10).

Care of the government over all the other faithful. And also over the overseers of the Churches; for, he instructs Timothy and Titus exactly concerning the character and conditions, which they must demand from those who are to be ordained Bishops, Priests and Deacons (1 Tim. 3:1-10; 2 Tim. 2:2; Tit. 1:5-9). In fact, he says that it pertains to them to examine and evaluate them carefully and to correct them, if they are at fault: *Let the elders who rule well be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in preaching and teaching... Never admit any charge against an elder except on the evidence of two or three witnesses. As for those who persist in sin, rebuke them in the presence of all, so that the rest may stand in fear* (1 Tim. 5:17-20; see Tit. 1:10-14). Over all the other faithful. For, by name he commends to Timothy and Titus one after the other—old men, young men, young women, widows, adolescents and slaves (1 Tim. 5:1-16; Tit. 2:2-10; 3:1f.), and he warns them how profligates, sinners and heretics are to be admonished and even excommunicated (2 Tim. 3:1-9; Tit. 1:10-14; 3:9-11).

Finally, he stresses the *universality and fullness* of this power, while saying: *Command and teach these things. Let no one despise your youth... For there are many insubordinate men, empty talkers and deceivers... teaching for base gain what they have no right to teach... rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith... Declare these things; exhort and reprove with all authority. Let no one disregard you* (2 Tim. 4:11f.; Tit. 1:10-13; 2:15). Hence it is clear that Timothy and Titus are shown as placed by St. Paul in total control of the Churches—in doctrine, in worship and in government, with a fullness of power over all the other faithful.

352. c) Finally, they are shown as established in authority received from God. For, they received their power by the imposition of hands, to which was annexed the granting of grace and the power to fulfill the pastoral office (2 Tim. 1:6-9.13f.; see 1 Tim. 4:14). But the office in the conferral of which grace is given cannot be conferred except with authority received from God. Moreover, those whom St. Paul had constituted as elders for the individual Churches (Acts. 14:23), were thought to be placed there by the Holy Spirit, although not a total, but only a partial power in the Churches was handed over to them, according to the words of St. Paul: *Take heed to yourselves and to all the*

flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of the Lord (Acts 20:28). Therefore, even with more reason the same is to be held regarding Timothy and Titus and Bishops in the proper sense, to whom not just a part of the power, but the total and complete care of the Church was entrusted, according as the magisterium of the Church has understood these words of St. Paul.¹³

353. Proof 4) From the testimonies of St. Clement and St. Ignatius.¹⁴

a) *St. Clement of Rome* (ca. 96) assumes as a principle that everything in the Church must be done according to the ordination of God, who said "we ought in proper order to do all things which the Lord has commanded us to perform at appointed times" (Cor. 40,1-3; R 19). Then he compares the divinely ordained hierarchy of the O.T. with the hierarchy of the N.T. and says that in the Church Christ was firmly constituted by the Father, the Apostles by Christ and the Bishops by the Apostles, properly arranged by divine ordination (R 20, 21). Therefore, St. Clement teaches that the Apostles by divine right are successors of the Apostles; surely at the very least this must be understood to refer to Bishops in the strict sense, or about those who de facto obtain the ordinary power of the Apostles, which is complete in its own kind.

354. b) *St. Ignatius* (ca. 107) when he speaks about Bishops understands them in the strict sense, or as those who in the Church have full power over all others, both the simple faithful and Deacons and Priests (R 48, 56, 65). Indeed, he openly teaches that the Bishop takes the place of God and has been sent by God (R 44); hence he concludes: "It is manifest that the Bishop must look to God himself, and obey him, since Jesus Christ really speaks to the faithful through the Bishop" (Eph. 6:1f.). Therefore, St. Ignatius holds that it can be said about the Bishops what Christ said about the Apostles: *He who receives you receives me; he who hears you hears me* (Matt. 10:40; Luke 10:16); therefore implicitly he acknowledges that they are empowered with the same divine authority, or with the same divine right.

13. Thus at least primarily and a fortiori the Councils of *Trent* and *Vatican I* (D 1767-1770, 3061) understood the words of Acts 20:28 to refer to Bishops in the strict sense. For a similar reason the Catholic Magisterium understands the same words: Celestine I (ML 50,507), Pius IX (D 1842 [34th ed.]), and Leo XIII in the Encyclicals "*Sapientiae christianae*," "*Divinum illud munus*," "*Depuis le jour*," "*Graves de communi*"; ASS 22 (1890) 391f.; 29 (1897) 650; 32 (1899) 207-; 33 (1901) 388. Benedict XV, "*Ad Beatissimi*"; AAS 6 (1914) 579. Pius XII, *Discorso nella S.Rom. Rota* 29 Oct. 1947, and Encyclical "*Mediator Dei*," and the *Constit. "Munificentissimus Deus*," and *Litt. Decret. "Quos Spiritus Sanctus*," and the *Letter "Cum Augustus"*: AAS 39 (1947) 497.547 42 (1950) 756; 44 (1952) 345; 46 (1954) 450.

14. Edit. F.X. Funk, *PP.Apostolici*, I. On the worth of the testimony of Clement and Ignatius, see H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.467-470.

355. Proof 5) from St. Irenaeus and Tertullian.

For, St. Irenaeus (ca. 180) and Tertullian (ca. 200) teach that the Bishops are the successors of the Apostles *by a formal succession*. But the successors of the Apostles by a formal succession are their successors by divine right. Therefore, St. Irenaeus and Tertullian teach that the Bishops are the successors of the Apostles by divine right.

Proof of the major: a) St. Irenaeus openly teaches: "If the Apostles knew secret mysteries, which they taught them separately and secretly from the others, they handed them on especially to these men (Bishops), to whom they were also entrusting the Churches. For, they wanted those men to be very perfect and irreprehensible in all things, whom they were leaving as their *successors*, handing on to them *their own office* of teaching" (Kch 124). These words cannot be properly understood unless they are taken to be about a formal succession.

b) Tertullian has this to say: "For in this manner do the Apostolic Churches... show those, whom being appointed by the Apostles to the Episcopate, they have as *transmitters* of the Apostolic seed." And so with the Bishops and those who agree with the Bishops as successors of the Apostles, he calls *heirs* of the Apostles, saying: "It is my possession; I have held it of old; I held it first: I have a sure title down from the first owners themselves, whose the estate was. I am the heir of the Apostles. As they provided by their own testament, as they committed it in trust, as they have adjured, so I hold it" (R 296, 298). This idea of hereditary succession necessarily implies the concept of a *formal succession*.

356. Part 2: By divine institution individual Bishops preside over one particular Church.

Proof. Since the time of the Apostles individual Bishops have presided over particular Churches, but from the middle of the 2nd century all Churches had monarchical Bishops. But this historical fact can be explained only from divine institution. Therefore from divine institution or by divine right individual Bishops have presided over particular Churches.

The major expresses a plain historical fact, which therefore must be proved in a historical way. But we will indicate that this took place by stages, beginning from the testimonies from the end of the 3rd century and going back to the time of the Apostles. *Note well that in the major* two things are asserted: first, since the time of the Apostles it is historically certain that Churches existed, over each one of which one Bishop presided; second, since the middle of the 2nd century it is historically certain that all the Churches were governed by monarchical Bishops.

357. Regarding the major: 1) Eusebius Caesariensis, whose authority regarding the history of the first three centuries of Christianity is recognized

by all to be great, in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, published at the beginning of the 4th century, a) presents complete catalogues of Bishops, who monarchically from the time of the Apostles succeeded in the governance of the Churches of *Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem*; but from other sources he collects many names of monarchical Bishops of the Churches of Corinth, Ephesus, Caesarea, Athens, Crete, Cappadocia, Hierapolis, Smyrna, Laodicea and Lyons; b) in his whole *History* Eusebius does not mention any Bishops except monarchical ones.

But this testimony from the end of the 3rd century, can easily be traced back to the middle of the 2nd century, since from the critical edition of his *History* it is certain that Eusebius faithfully reported knowledge about these Bishops, which he borrowed from Julius Africanus (ca. 235), from St. Irenaeus (ca. 180) and from Hegesippus (ca. 160).

Therefore, Eusebius bears witness: a) that from the time of the Apostles Churches existed in each one of which an individual Bishop presided; b) that from the middle of the 2nd century there were no Bishops except monarchical ones.¹⁵

358. Regarding the major. 2) From the harmonious testimony of Tertullian, St. Irenaeus and Hegesippus. a) Tertullian (ca. 200), while refuting the adversaries and intending to convince them with an invincible argument, says that the apostolic Churches show the orders of their own Bishops by a series of successions proceeding from the Apostles. And as apostolic he mentions the Churches of Smyrna, Rome, Corinth, Thessalonica, Ephesus, Philippi (R 296f.).

b) St. Irenaeus (ca. 180), in order to prove decisively the falsehood of the adversaries, testifies that he can list in every Church the Bishops as successors of the Apostles, but for the sake of brevity he describes only the succession of the Roman Pontiffs from St. Peter down to St. Eleutherius (ca. 180), in which the monarchical nature of the succession is evident. Therefore it can be concluded that the successions of the other Churches, which Irenaeus knew about, were of the same nature; but he does mention several Churches in Germany, Spain, Gaul (France), the Orient, Egypt, Libya and "in the middle of the world" (R 209-211; K 124-126).

c) Hegesippus (ca. 160) says that he visited several Bishops in order to find out whether the tradition received from the Apostles was being faithfully preserved or not; and he says that in Rome he composed a list of the Bishops up to the time of Anacetus (155-166), which he then expanded

15. C.H. Turner, *Apostolic Succession*: edit. H.B. Swete, *Essays on the Early History of the Church* (1921) 93-214; E. Caspar, *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste* (1926); J. Salaverri, *Le sucesión apostólica en la "Historia ecclesiastica" de Eusebio Cesariense*: Greg 14 (1933) 219-247. For the critical edition of the History of Eusebius, see E. Schwartz: GChS, *Eusebius* 2,1-3.

up to the time of Eleutherius (ca. 180), concluding: "In each succession of the Bishops and in all the cities the same things remain, which were preached through the law and the prophets and by the Lord himself" (R 188).

Therefore Tertullian, St. Irenaeus and Hegesippus agree in testifying: 1) that individual bishops presided over the individual Churches since the time of the Apostles; 2) and they mention only monarchical Bishops. Hence by the middle of the 2nd century the Bishops of the Churches everywhere were monarchical.

359. Regarding the major. 3) Further confirmation of the proof of the major (under 1-2). *On the occasion of the controversies about the day of Easter and the heresy of Montanus*, much information has survived concerning other monarchical Bishops of several other Churches, both in the West and in the East (Kch 91-101).

a) The Roman Bishop Victor (ca. 190), with a greater number of Churches, celebrated it on the first Sunday which occurred after the 14th day of the month of Nisam. But Polycrates, the Bishop of Ephesus along with the Churches of proconsular Asia, held that Christ died on the 14th day of the month of Nisam and therefore he celebrated Easter on the 16th day of the same month, although it did not fall on a Sunday. In order to solve doubts about this and to obtain uniformity, several councils of Bishops were held, whose decrees, according to Eusebius, appeared about the year 300 in Rome, Palestine, Edessa, Pontus, Corinth and Lyons. But Polycrates in favor of his opinion appealed to the apostolic tradition of the Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Eumenia, Laodicea and Sardis. In fact all the Bishops, who were present at these councils, are shown as successors of the Apostles, whose proper office it was to protect the traditions received from the Apostles, and they are mentioned only as individuals for the individual Churches.

b) *Against Montanus*, who preached in Phrygia that a new revelation from the Holy Spirit had been given to him, the Bishops assembled (ca. 160) from the Churches of Hierapolis, Comana, Apamea and Antioch; from the Churches of Thrace the Bishops of Debeltus and Anchialis. All these Bishops are presented as monarchical and as successors of the Apostles (see Kch 218).

360. Regarding the major. 4) *Testimony of the disciples of the Apostles.* St. Ignatius (ca. 107) wrote seven letters to the Churches of Rome, Antioch, Ephesus, Magnesia, Trallis, Philadelphia and Smyrna, in which he teaches the monarchical Episcopate instituted by the Apostles so clearly that

therefore non-Catholics have tried many times in vain to prove that his letters are not genuine (R 38-37).

361. Regarding the major. 5) Apostolic testimony. St. John the Apostle (ca. 96) includes in the book of Revelation (chapters 1-3) seven letters to the “stars” or “angels” of the particular Churches of Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia and Laodicea. Indeed the *Angels* to whom the letters are directed: a) cannot signify the guardian angels of those Churches, as many Greeks thought along with Origen, because they are said to be worthy of praise or blame because of things proper to men that are attributed to them; b) they cannot be personifications of the Churches, because they are expressly distinguished from the Churches, both in the creeds and in the explanation of the creeds (Rev. 1:12.16.20).

Therefore, a third interpretation remains, which with St. Augustine the Latin Fathers and exegetes generally hold and it says: the “Angels” are the directors or head of the Churches that are mentioned.¹⁶ For, just as in the text the “lampstands” represent the particular Churches, which are mentioned, similarly the “Stars” or “Angels” must represent something particular pertaining to those Churches. But the things that are recommended in the letters are the proper offices of the leaders or Bishops (see Rev. 2:18-29). Therefore, the “Angels” represent the Bishops of the Churches.

362. This conclusion can be proved also from the use of Scripture, in which Priests, Doctors, Prophets, Apostles and others are designated with the same symbols: *Stars: Simon, the high priest, like the morning star in the temple of God* (Sir. 50:6-7); *those who turn many to righteousness, like the stars shall shine for ever and ever* (Dan. 12:3). *Angels: the priest is the angel of the Lord of hosts* (Mal. 2:7); *Behold, I send my angel* (Mal. 3:1 = Matt. 11:10); the Apostles are called angels (Gal. 4:14; 1 Tim. 3:16); other human messengers are called angels (Luke 7:24; 9:52; Jas. 2:25; Hag. 1:13). Indeed, the “Angels” or “Bishops,” about whom St. John speaks in the seven letters, clearly are presented as monarchical, because the total care for the individual Churches is assumed to be placed in the hands of the individual Bishops. Therefore since the time of the Apostles monarchical Bishops were known in the Church.

363. Regarding the major. 6) From the Acts of the Apostles. There it is sufficiently clear that St. James was the Bishop of Jerusalem, to whom the total care of that Church had been entrusted. For, when St. Peter was miraculously freed from prison (ca. 43), he

16. St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 1.12,16: ML 34,43.

took care to see that his freedom should be made known to James (Acts 12:17). Afterwards (ca. 50) at the *Council of the Apostles*, when a question about legal requirements was decided by Peter, James, in order to avoid offending the faithful converts from among the Jews, proposed a decree of abstinence, which was promulgated everywhere (Acts 15:13-21). Finally, when Paul had gone up to Jerusalem (ca. 58), *he went to see James*, and all the elders were gathered together with him; but James, in order to avoid disturbing the faithful of that Church, enjoined St. Paul that he purify himself in the temple; then Paul out of obedience did that (Acts. 21:15-26). From these facts it has usually been inferred not unreasonably that James was the monarchical Bishop of Jerusalem.

364. Regarding the major. 7) From St. Paul. For, in his pastoral letters he manifests to us *Timothy at Ephesus* and *Titus on Crete* placed in total pastoral care of those Churches, with full authority over all the other faithful; each of them was placed over one Church, as was explained in the first part. But we call such men monarchical Bishops. Therefore St. Paul also gives us at least two examples of monarchical Bishops, who had already obtained this office as ordinary and proper, or at least were going to obtain it after the death of the Apostle, according to the explanation given in the preceding part.

365. The minor (n. 356). *This historical fact can be explained only from divine institution.* A. Because it is repugnant physically, psychologically and historically. a) *It is repugnant physically*, that a natural free evolution in such distant and various places should, by its own nature, lead to the same effect everywhere and in such a short space of time. b) *It is repugnant psychologically*, both by the psychology of individuals and by social psychology: for, it is opposed to the inborn ambition of individuals that an organization, initially democratic, should everywhere through the influence of one man become monarchical; moreover, it is opposed to the social nature of the Church that such an important change should take place in it, in which this was held by all as a primary and immutable axiom: "Nothing is to be accepted except what was handed on by the Apostles" (see Luke 1:2; 1 Cor. 15:11.58; Phil.4:9; 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:12). c) *Finally, it is repugnant historically*, that such a profound and widespread change should occur everywhere in one Church, while no certain historical records of it have survived.

367. B. A natural, free evolution lacks a historical foundation. a) They appeal to the *Liber Pontificalis* (Kch 1003f.), and they confirm its testimony from Tertullian (R 296); hence they conclude that from the beginning the Roman Episcopacy was collegial, since it was administered at the same time by St. Peter and by the Bishops Linus, Cletus and Clement. However, the testimony can be well explained because St. Peter really ordained the Bishops Saints Linus, Cletus and Clement, and at first used them as his auxiliaries in caring for the Roman Church; but Tertullian intends to stress

very much against his adversaries that in the Roman Church Clement was known personally by St. Peter.

But if the *Liber Pontificalis* intends to signify something, it can be replied that it is from the 6th century (526-530), and contrary to its testimony are the clearer testimonies of St. Augustine from the beginning of the 5th century (R 1418), of Optatus Milevitanus at the end of the 4th century (Kch 584), of an *anonymous Poem* from the same time (R 897), of St. Epiphanius from the middle of the 4th century (R 1092), of the *Liberian Catalogue* from about the same time (Kch 545), of Eusebius at the end of the 3rd century, and of other ancient witnesses all the way to the time of the Apostles, whom we have mentioned in our proof.¹⁷

368. b) They appeal to the *silence* of St. Clement writing to the *Corinthians* (R 25-27), of St. Polycarp to the *Philippians* (R 73), of St. Ignatius to the *Romans* (R 52-55). However, contrary to the genuine, positive and clear testimonies, which we have provided, such silence proves nothing; for, it cannot be shown that these authors necessarily ought to have named the Bishop of those Churches. This omission can be explained either from the purpose intended by the authors, or from other contingent circumstances of men, or also because those Churches at the time did not have a Bishop, or because of the persecutions it was necessary to hide the name of the Bishop.

c) They appeal to the Egyptian Church in which there seem to have been several Bishops at the same time (R 1357). But if that was actually the case, then it must be conceded that that Church then was not ordered correctly and perfectly. However, if the situation then is examined more carefully, one finds that among them there was one Bishop in the proper sense, and the others were only vicars or auxiliaries.¹⁸ Therefore we can rightly conclude that *a natural, free evolution lacks a historical foundation*.

369. 2) *Divine institution explains very well the fact of the monarchical Episcopate and is demanded by the sources*. A) What explains the fact very well is conceded by all and is easily made apparent. For, if Christ positively decreed that the Bishops of the particular Churches should be monarchical, since also it is established in the Church that everything in it positively instituted by Christ is necessarily perpetual, it is easy to understand why de facto the Bishops from the beginning in some places, and from the middle of the 2nd century everywhere, appear to be monarchical.

370. B) *It is demanded by the sources*. For, in the letters, which St. John transmitted to us (Rev. 1-3), Christ himself is represented as holding in his

17. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.368,4 A.

18. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.370. See P. Batiffol, *Etudes d'hist. et de Théol. Positive* (1926) excurs. A 267-280.

right hand, in direct and immediate dependence on himself, *seven stars* or Bishops, and positively imposing the office and obligation on each of the seven Bishops to have total care of the seven Churches; he does this in such a way that each one in the presence of Christ is fully responsible for the health or infirmity of the Christian life in each one of the Churches.¹⁹ Therefore, although previously, while the remaining Apostles still were living on earth, the divine institution of the monarchical Episcopate was not yet apparent, nevertheless by the end of the first century, through this revelation made by St. John, it is already evident from the institution of Christ that monarchical Bishops are presiding over the individual Churches.

But with St. Ignatius, at the beginning of the 2nd century, and later with St. Irenaeus, the universal tradition of the Church always understood that the Bishops, who by the institution of Christ preside over the individual Churches, are monarchical only. Therefore it is demanded by the sources that by the institution of Christ individual or monarchical Bishops preside over the individual Churches.

371. Scholium 1. *On the use of the words Bishop (Episcopus) and Priest (Presbyter).*²⁰ A Bishop, by reason of the word, is the same as an overseer. In profane use under this name those were designated who presided over some office. In the books of the O.T., a Bishop is said to be someone who is in charge either of profane or sacred things.

A priest, by reason of the word, is the same as an elder. In profane use Elders are called members of a college, from whom some function is required. Such a college is called a *senate*. In the books of the O.T., Elders are called those who in a collegial manner preside over a people or a city in profane and sacred matters.

372. *In the books of the N.T.* 1) A local leader is called an *Elder*, whether he is a Bishop in the proper sense, or just a priest subject to the Bishop. The authors agree on this.

2) If someone is designated by the name of *Bishop*, the authors do not

19. See J. Colson, *L'Évêque dans les communautés primitives* (1951) c.6 p.81-90.

20. S.Th. II-II, q. 184, a. 6 ad 1; D. Petavius, *De ecclesiastica Hierarchia, Dogmata theologica* (1867) v.7 p.407ff.; v.8 p.97-405; A. Michiels, *L'origine de l'Episcopate* (1900); Id., *Evêques*: DAFC 1,1750-1786; E. Bruders, *Die Verfassung der Kirche* (1904); F. Prat, *Evêques*: DTC 5,1656-1701; E. Ruffini, *La Gerarchia della Chiesa* (1921); P. Batiffol, *La Hiérarchie primitive: Etudes d'histoire et de Théologie positive* (1926) 225-266; M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* (1928) n.362f.; U. Holzmeister, *Si quis Episcopatum desiderat*: Bibl 12 (1931) 41-69; L. Marchal, *Evêques*: DBS 1297-1333; V. Cavalla, *Episcopi et Presbiteri nella Chiesa primitiva*: ScuoCatt 64 (1936) 235-226; G.M. Perrella, *Spiritus Sanctus posuit Episcopos* (Acts 20:28): DivThom (Pi) 14 (1937) 172-176; T. Zapelena, *De Presbyteris-Episcopis ephesinis in Conc. Tridentino*: MiscBibl 24 (1943) 370-387; J.M. Bover, *Los Presbiteros-Obispos de Efeso: Telogia de S.Pablo* (1946) 1.7 c.2 p.534-539; see L. Turrado, *Carácter jerárquico de Tito, Timoteo, Silas, Lucas y otros compañeros de S.Pablo*: CiencTom 71 (1946) 82-105; Beyer in Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch z. N.T.* (1950) 2,604-619.

agree and they take two different positions.²¹ a) *The name of Bishop* in the N.T. is used as a *synonym* for the name of *Elder*, and therefore by it is designated both a Bishop in the proper sense and a mere priest subject to the Bishop—the authors with St. Thomas generally hold this view; it is also held recently in treatises *On the Church* by De Groot, Pesch, Wilmers, Felder, Muncunill, D’Herbigny, Dieckmann, Dorsch, Vellico, and others, who agree with them in special articles: Michiels, Bruders, Batiffol, Prat, Ruffini, Holzmeister, Marshal. Authorities quoted in favor of this opinion from the Latin Fathers are Ambrosiaster, St. Jerome, Pelagius, St. Isidore, St. Bede; from the Greeks, St. Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Oecumenius, Theophylactus.²²

373. b) *That by the name of Bishop* is designated in the N.T. only Bishops in the proper sense, especially in Acts 20:28, is held by Petavius, Perrone, Franzelin, Knabenbauer, Felten, Belser, Lercher (ed. 1927), Bover, and others. Cited in favor of this opinion are St. Irenaeus, St. Epiphanius, Silviu, Estius, Patrizi, and others; and in its favor are adduced the *Councils of Trent and Vatican I*, and also other arguments of the ecclesiastical Magisterium.²³

Although in the books of the N.T. the *names* are not yet found determined, by which they are designated, still it is necessary to hold that *the offices themselves* of Bishop and Priest already in the apostolic age were accurately distinguished. Especially in St. Ignatius of Antioch (ca. 107) the names are distinguished with great care, so that in his writings the word “Bishop” is always used for a Bishop in the proper sense, while by the word “Presbyter” or “Elder” priests are designated who are described as fully subordinate to the Bishop.

374. **Scholium 2.** *On the mediate or immediate origin from God of the jurisdiction of Bishops.* This question was raised in the Councils of Trent and Vatican I, but it was not decided. Several authors with Victoria and Vázquez held that the jurisdiction is given *immediately* by God to the individual Bishops; but generally Catholic authors with St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, St. Robert Bellarmine and Suarez hold that jurisdiction is

21. H. Van Laak, *Institutiones Theologiae fundamentalis de Ecclesia* th.45; he summarizes accurately the various opinions of the authors, and reduces them to six types, of which he recounts the principle arguments and difficulties. See F.C. Ceulemans, *In Act.* appendix.

22. See the authors we cited in note 20. A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* p.229-242; D. Petavius, *Dogmata theologica* (1867) v.7 p.409; Io. Perrone, *Praelect.* v.8 n.104.

23. J.B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia* (1887) th.16. Ch. Pesch, *Praelectiones* 1 n.339-343, says that this opinion is probable. I. Knabenbauer, Felten and Belser defend it in their *Comment. in Act 20,28*. L. Lercher in the edition prepared by F. Schlagenhaufen (1939) n.326, mentions the principal opinions, but which one he prefers is not manifest. From the Catholic Magisterium some argument are presented in favor of this opinion in note 13. J.M. Bover, *Teología de S.Pablo* (1946); T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) 55-71.

given to the Bishops immediately not by God but *mediated* through the Roman Pontiff. Pius XII teaches this opinion positively in the Encyclical, "*Mystici Corporis*," when he says: "But the Bishops so far as their own diocese is concerned... are not completely independent but are subject to the proper authority of the Roman Pontiff, although they enjoy ordinary power of jurisdiction received directly from the Sovereign Pontiff himself."²⁴ We think that his opinion is to be preferred.

375. Objections. 1. St. Paul does not instruct Timothy and Titus as Bishops and successors in the ordinary office of the Apostles. Therefore nothing can be deduced from the pastoral letters.

I distinguish the antecedent. St. Paul does not instruct Timothy and Titus as Bishops, who have succeeded in the ordinary office of the Apostles, *I bypass the antecedent*; he does not instruct them so that they may know how they ought to proceed in the Church, who after the death of St. Paul are going to succeed in his ordinary office, *denied*. For, he is instructing them, since he already knows that his death is near (2 Tim. 4:5-8), concerning what must be observed in the Church until the coming of the Lord, and how they are to take care in appointing successors in the Church. Therefore he is instructing them at least as men who will succeed him in the future.

376. 2. In Scripture the Bishops are shown as equal to the Priests (Acts 20:17.28; Phil. 1:12; Tit. 1:5-7).

I distinguish the assertion. They are shown as equal in name, so that Bishops are also called Priests and vice versa, *I bypass that*; they are shown as equal in their office, *I subdistinguish*: inadequately, *conceded*; adequately, *denied*.

377. 3. St. Jerome teaches that Bishops and Priests are completely equal. For, in his Commentary on Tit. and in Letter 146 (R 1357, 1371) he teaches the following²⁵:

a) "A Priest is the same as a Bishop," which he proves from Tit. 1:5-7; Phil. 1:1-2; Acts 20:17.28; 1 Pet. 5:1-2; Heb. 13:17, and he concludes: "As we shall show, among the ancients Priests were the same as Bishops."

b) In the beginning, "the Churches were governed by a common council of Priests." "Later one was elected who was placed above the others as a remedy for schism." "But gradually, in order to remove the seeds of dissension, all the care of the community was

24. Pius XII, "*Mystici Corporis*": AAS 35 (1943) 211f.; and "*Ad Sinarum gentem*": AAS 47 (1955) 9: "the power of jurisdiction comes to the Bishops by divine right, but only through the Successor of Peter." See C. Mazzella, *De Relig. Et Ecclesia* n.1001-1015; Ch. Pesch, *Praelect.* 1, n.370f. The reasons for both opinions are briefly assembled with a bibliography by A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* (1940) p.580-587. See also T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) 105-115; J. Lainez, *Disputationes tridentinae*, t.1 *De origine iurisdictionis Episcoporum*.

25. You will find the opinions of St. Jerome, which cause some difficulty, in the same order in which they are adduced as testimony: a) *Comment. In Tit. 1,5*: R 1371, and also ML 26,562-563; *Epist. 146 ad Evangel.* 1 R1357, also ML 22,1192-1193. b) *in Tit.1:5*: R 1371, also ML 26,56; *Epist. 146*: R 1357. c) *In Tit. 1,5*: R 1371, also ML 26,56. d) *Epist. 146 ad Evangel.* 1: ML 22,1194.

given to one man.”

c) “In the whole world it was decreed that one elected from the Priests would be placed over the others, to whom all the care of the Church would pertain, in order to remove the seeds of schism.” “Therefore just as the Priests know from the custom of the Church that they are to be subject to the one who has been placed over them, so the Bishops know that they are, more by custom than by a disposition of the Lord, superior to the Priests, and that they must govern the Church.”

d) Bishops and Priests “are all successors of the Apostles.”

378. Hence St. Jerome seems to hold: a) from Scripture that a Bishop is equal to a Priest; b) that at first the Churches were governed by a college of Priests, but afterwards one of them, in order to avoid schisms, was elected as the leader; c) that a Bishop, *not by divine law but by a decree and custom of the Church*, is greater than the Priests; d) that Bishops and also Priests are successors of the Apostles.

379. Response. The same St. Jerome also teaches the following.²⁶

a) “At that time they gave the same name to Bishops and also to the Elders: the former is the *name* of an office and the latter refers to age.”

b) “No one should claim obstinately that there were many Bishops in one Church.” “Certainly in one city there could not be several Bishops, as they are called” (Phil. 1:1-2).

c) “Bishops have the power to establish priests in all the cities.” “What does a Bishop do, *with the exception of ordination*, that a Priest cannot do?” “I do not deny that this is the custom of the Church—that the Bishop comes, for the invocation of the Holy Spirit, to place his hands on those who have been baptized by Priests and Deacons.”

d) “Among *us the Bishops hold the place of the Apostles*: among them (Montanists) the Bishop is third... what among us is first, among them is last.” “But if you ask why one baptized in the Church does not receive the Holy Spirit except by the hands of the Bishop, you should understand that it comes from the fact that after the Ascension of the Lord the Holy Spirit descended on the Apostles.” “The salvation of the Church depends on the dignity of the High Priest; if there are those who do not receive their eminent power from him, then in the Church there are as many schisms as there are priests.”

380. Hence St. Jerome also holds: a) In the books of the N.T. that Bishops are also called Priests and vice versa; b) that in one Church, already at the time of St. Paul, there could be only one Bishop; c) that the power of ordaining Priests pertained to the Bishop alone, and also to place them in individual cities, and that to the Bishop was reserved the right to confirm those whom the Priests had baptized; d) that the Bishops are the successors of the Apostles simply and with full rights.

Therefore *now in form* regarding this object, the *response* can be given: St. Jerome from Scripture infers that a Bishop is equal to a Priest and it is only by a decree and

26. See these other opinions of St. Jerome that should be kept in mind; they are in the same order in which we cite them: a) *In Tit. 1,5*: ML 26, 563; b) *Epist. 146 in Evang. I*: R 1357; *In Tit. 1,5*: ML 26,562; c) *In Tit. 1,5*: ML 26,562; *Epist. 146*: R 1357; *Dialog. Contra Lucifer. 9*: R 1359; d) *Epist. 41 ad Marcellum 3*: ML 22,476; *Dialog. Contra Lucifer. 9*: R 1359, and also ML 23,164.

the custom of the Church that he is greater; that is, equal in *name* and greater in the accidentals of the office, *conceded*; equal by divine right in the essentials of the office, *I subdistinguish*: regarding the faculty of consecrating the Body and Blood of the Lord and offering the Eucharistic sacrifice, *conceded*; regarding the ordinary power received from the Apostles of teaching, sanctifying and governing, *denied*.

381. St. Jerome in *Epistle* 146 clarifies his intention when he says: "I am told that someone has been mad enough to put deacons before presbyters." But he declares his mind in his Commentary on Tit.1:5-7 when he says: "Let the bishops hear, who out of contempt for the law of the Apostle, do not want to confer an ecclesiastical grade on someone *because of his merit*, but rather to do it as a *favor*, that (they) are doing this against the will of Christ, who decreed through his Apostle what kind of priests should be consecrated in his Church." Therefore the purpose intended by St. Jerome is to protect the dignity of Presbyters against the audacity of the Deacons, and to exhort the bishops to consecrate worthy priests; therefore he extols the priesthood, making it equal as much as he can to bishops, especially by reason of the power over the Eucharist, as is clearly implied in these words of St. Jerome: "For the Apostle clearly teaches that Presbyters are the same as Bishops... through whose prayer the body and blood of Christ are produced" (R 1357). Also it must be admitted that St. Jerome, caught up in the heat of controversy, exaggerates quite bit.²⁷

382. 4. According to Cullmann, the Apostolate of the N.T. is a singular and unique office, given by Jesus himself immediately to his Apostles, so that they would announce the life, doctrine and resurrection of Christ as eyewitnesses of his historical life and resurrection. But the Apostles could carry out such an office only in a personal way; and they did accomplish it by their oral preaching, which remains consigned to the books of the N.T. definitively once and for all time. Therefore the Bishops cannot be said to be successors of the Apostles in the strict sense, "or continuers of the same apostolic function," which is totally different from any function that the Bishops could exercise.²⁸

I distinguish the major. The idea of the Apostolate given by Cullmann is inadequate since it considers only some *extraordinary* offices, gifts and works of the Apostles, *conceded*; it is adequate in including also the *ordinary* and essential powers and functions of the Apostles, *denied*.

27. On the opinion of St. Jerome, see H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* 281-288; P. Batiffol, *Discussion d'un texte de S.Jérôme*: Etud. d.hist. et de Théol. Positive (1926) p.267-280; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) p.71-94.

28. O. Cullmann, *S.Pierre Disciple-Apôtre-Martyr* (1952) 193-200. Many authors criticized the theory of Cullmann, not only Catholics but also non-Catholics. See among others: O. Karrer, *Um die Einheit der Christen, die Petrusfrage, ein Gespräch mit...* O. Cullmann (1953); Ch. Journet, *Primauté de Pierre dans la perspective protestante et catholique* (1953); G. Vodopivec, *EuntDoc* 6 (1953) 81-109; L. Cerfaux, *RechScRel* 41 (1953) 182-202; J. Danielou *Etud* 276 (1953) 206-219; Id., *DieuViv* 24 (1953) 107-116; P. Nober, *Verbum* 31 (1953) 45-48; P. Gaechter, *ZkathTh* 75 (1953) 331-337; P. Bonnard, *RevThPh* 3 (1953) 31-34; G. Dejaifve, *NouvRevTh* 85 (1953) 365-369; W. Bulst, *Schol* 28 (1953) 264-267; M. Meinertz, *ZtsMisswRelw* 37 (1953) 235-239; F.M. Braun, *RevThom* 53 (1953) 389-403; P. Bennoit, *RevBibl* 60 (1953) 565-579; A. Vögtl, *MünchThZts* 5 (1954) 1-47; J. Hamer, *RevNouv* 19 (1954) 92-97; E. Molland, *RevHistPhilRel* 34 (1954) 1-29; F.X. Murphy, *IrEccRec* 81 (1954) 436-443; A.M. Javierre, *Sucesión Apostólica*: Salesianum 16 (1954) 80-108; O. Karrer, *Apostolische Nachfolge und Primat*: *ZkathTh* 77 (1955) 129-168.

I bypass the minor and distinguish the consequent. The Bishops cannot be said to be the successors of the Apostles in the strict sense in their *extraordinary* gifts, offices and functions, *conceded*; in their *ordinary* and essential powers and functions, *denied*.

According to the sources, the *extraordinary* offices, gifts and works given to them alone personally by Christ are reported to be mainly these: a) The *immediate* choice by Christ, the mission and full instruction *to be eyewitnesses* of the life, teaching and resurrection of Christ; b) *The gift of miracles* by which God confirmed their testimony; c) Personal *infallibility* and the visible outpouring upon them of the *charisms* of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, whereby clothed "with power from on high" they faithfully begin and perfect the work of laying the foundations of the whole Church; d) The immediate *revelation* or *inspiration* of Christ or the Holy Spirit, α) *to constitute* the integral *deposit of faith* which Christ brought to men, or the word of God written or handed on, β) *to establish the means of sanctification* instituted by Christ for men, γ) *to establish the essential offices* decreed by Christ for the governance of the Church.

According to the sources, the *ordinary* and essential powers and functions of the Apostles are: a) The Magisterium to protect, to integrally transmit and to faithfully explain the deposit of faith constituted once and for all by the Apostles themselves; b) The priesthood to truly offer sacrifice and efficaciously administer the means of salvation once and for all given to the Apostles by Christ; c) The *command* to govern the flock of the faithful and to ordain hierarchically for this purpose Bishops, Priests and Ministers, according to the directions the Apostles received from Christ as valid for all time.

Indeed, according to the express command of the Lord (which we do not find cited in the work of Cullmann) these ordinary powers and functions of the Apostles will have to be exercised under the divine assistance *until the end of the world* (Matt. 28:20; John 14:16; 1 Cor. 11:26). But the Apostles were not able to exercise them perpetually, neither in their own persons because they were going to die, nor by the writings of the N.T. alone, which recount indeed that the powers were given to the Church, but they cannot confer them or efficaciously exercise them. Therefore, *there will always be* in the Church those who, in the name and by the authority of the Apostles, have the office of teaching, offering the Eucharistic sacrifice, administering baptism and the other means of salvation, ruling and designating priests and the other ministers of the Church, who in perpetuity require the observance by the faithful of all things "whatsoever Christ commanded." But we call these *Bishops successors by divine right of the Apostles* in their ordinary office of teacher, priest and ruler of the Church.

ARTICLE III

THE ROMAN PONTIFF IS THE SUCCESSOR IN THE PRIMACY

Thesis 9. In the perennial Primacy by divine right the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter.

383. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 10; *Supp.* q. 40, a. 6; 4 CG 76; see *De pot.*, q.10, a. 3 ad 13; St. Bonaventure, *Quaest. disp. de perfect. Evangel paupert.* q.4, a. 3; Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.2f.; *Defensio fidei* l.3 c.13-18; St. Rob. Bellarmine, *Controv.* 3 l.2 c.13-31; Franzelin, th.11; Palmieri, th.8f.; Wilmers, th.39-41; Van Laak, *Instit. Theol. fundam.*, *De Ecclesia* n.97-113; Id., *Repetitorium, De Ecclesia* th.6-8; De Groot, q.15 a.4; Straub, th.15; Ottiger, 2 p.509-817; Billot, th.28; Muncunill, n.356-392; Schultes, a.47; D'Herbigny, th.24 n.281-313; Dieckmann, th.21 n.507-542; G. Glez, *Primauté*: DTC 13,247-344; Lercher, th.33; Cotter, th.30; Zapelena, th.10; J.Madoz, *El Primado: Fuentes y documentos* (1936); E. Giles, *Documents Illustrating Papal Authority* (1952); I. de Torquemada, *Oratio synodalis de Primatu*, edit. E. Candal, Conc. Florent. S.B., vol. 2 (1954).

384. Connection. We have already demonstrated (thesis 7) that the Primacy in the Church by divine right is perennial. In this thesis we ask in addition who the person is who de facto obtains this Primacy by divine right.

385. Definition of terms. *The Primacy* is the supreme monarchical power over the whole Church, to last forever, which Christ instituted and conferred on St. Peter (see thesis 5).

What has been established by *divine right* we understand to be what has its origin and value "from the institution of Christ himself" (see D 3058).

That power is *perennial* which is going to continue perpetually until the end of the world, as was explained in the thesis on perpetuity (thesis 7).

386. The Roman Pontiff is understood to be *the successor of St. Peter*, not merely materially, but also *formally*, that is, the substitute for the person of St. Peter in all the ordinary power joined to the office of Primacy, without any change of law. Therefore, when the condition has been fulfilled for a legitimate election and the acceptance of the same, the Roman Pontiff by divine right itself obtains the same supreme power of jurisdiction with which Christ fully constituted St. Peter to be his Vicar on earth or as the supreme head of the visible universal Church (see CIC 109, 219 [1917]).

387. The Roman Pontiff is the legitimate Bishop of the Roman Diocese. But in the thesis this is understood, *not in a reduplicative manner*, or as and inasmuch as he is the Roman Bishop, *but in a specifying manner*, or who is the legitimate Bishop of the Roman Diocese. For, according to Vatican Council I, two things in the matter must be carefully distinguished: 1) *The law of perpetual succession* in the Primacy, and 2) *the condition of*

succession in the same perennial Primacy. *The law* of perpetual succession is a positive ordination, whereby Christ formally established that St. Peter perpetually should have successors in the Primacy. *The condition* of the succession is the fact of the Roman Episcopate, by which it comes about that the successor in the Primacy is only the Roman Bishop. Indeed, *the law of succession is perpetual by divine right; but the condition of succession*, according to the various opinions of Catholics, is *either by divine right, or by a human-ecclesiastical right, or by an ecclesiastical-apostolic right*, according to the nature of the right whereby St. Peter de facto joined succession in the Primacy with the Roman Episcopate.¹

388. State of the question. In the thesis we abstract from the nature of the law by which succession in the Primacy is connected with the Roman Episcopate, and we defend what in Vatican Council I was defined in a solemn judgment (D 3058).

389. The adversaries against this thesis are numberless. 1) All *non-Catholics*, whether they are called Christians or renounce the Christian name, unanimously reject the Roman Primacy.

2) Also opposed to this thesis are all those we mentioned as adversaries in the theses on the Primacy of St. Peter (theses 4 and 5), and also in the thesis preceding this one on the hierarchical succession of the Apostles.

390. 3) Those who refuse to admit *the hierarchical nature of the Church* instituted by Christ: Marsilius of Padua (D 942-944), Wycliffe (D 1158, 1187, 1191), Hus (D 1209, 1227-1229; see D 1264), Luther (D 1475), *Jansenists* (D 2329), *Febronians* (D 2592-2597), the *Synod of Pistoia* (D 2602-2603). All *Protestants* belong here, and also those who say that the Church and her head are subject to the authority of the State.

4) Those who refuse to recognize *the monarchical constitution of the Church*; they are the *Anglicans*, *Episcopalians*, *Presbyterians*; agreeing with them are the so-called *Old Catholics*, or those who refuse to accept the definition of Vatican I about the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, and who with Döllinger separated themselves from the Roman Church, crying out "away from Rome."²

391. 5) Opposed to this thesis in a special way are the *Eastern Schismatics*, who after the middle of the 9th century with Michael Cerularius

1. Msi 51,600; 52,10.31.1100.1115.1118. See Th. Granderath, *Const. Dogm. Conc. Vaticani* 137-149.

2. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.206,3.

effected a separation from the Roman Church, and after the Turks captured Constantinople, in 1453, they proclaimed the Patriarchal See of the Russian Orthodox Church to be the third Rome; they claimed that the supreme authority was conferred on the Russian Patriarch in the year 1917 by a rite in which they handed him "the Pastoral Scepter of St. Peter."

The doctrine and difficulties of the Orientals concerning the Primacy, by which they try to rebut the arguments of Catholics, were assembled together in the *Encyclica Synodi Constantinopolitanae* in the year 1848. It was endorsed by 33 Orthodox Bishops in response to the *Encyclical* of Pius IX published in the same year, *In suprema Petri Apostoli Sede*, in which the Supreme Pontiff exhorted them to return to the unity of the Catholic Church.³

To these can be added others who are no less opposed—all *Pan-Christians* or proponents of *Ecumenism*, like Heiler, Tomkins, Visser't Hooft, and others, who defend the complete autonomy of the Churches and aspire to establish some kind of federation. In particular, Barth says: "The governance of the Church pertains properly and exclusively to Christ the Lord; and therefore the papal system, on a higher level still than the *Episcopal*, harms the free preaching of the word in a free Congregation of the living Christ, which is the Church." Similarly Craig says: "Christ himself alone is the supreme head of the Church, he alone possesses the right to govern it." But Cullmann denies the very possibility of a successor of St. Peter.⁴

392. 6) Evolutionist sensism, which the *Modernists* follow, holds that the Church and its Primacy is nothing other than a part of the collective consciousness, which is subject to the law of vital evolution. Therefore, just as the religious sense, stirred up and driven by merely political conditions, at the end of the 2nd century, gave rise to the Primacy in the Church, so also in our days it moves us to adopt a *democratic form*. But it is necessary to obey the religious sense demanding this, unless we want to arouse and encourage an internal war in the consciences of men (Pius X, "*Lamentabili*" and the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" (D 3453-3458, 3492, 3493).

393. 7) The rationalistic form critics, since the beginning of the 20th century, totally reject the divine right of the Primacy, derived from St. Peter

3. See M. Jugie, *Theol. Dogm. Christianorum Orientalium* 4 p.362-423; Id., DTC 13,344-391; Th. Spáčil, *Conceptus et doctrina de Ecclesia iuxta Theologiam Orientis separati*: OrCh 2 (1924) 57-72; M. D'Herbigny, *De Eccles.* n.283. Msi 40,377-418 prints the encyclical against the Primacy signed by 33 Oriental Bishops; among other things it says: "the Roman Church does not have anything but a certain precedence among the brothers in the universal Church: that is, it obtains honor conceded to the Roman Bishop by reason of the antiquity and splendor of the Queen City; but by no means does it derive from the Apostles the Vicariate of Christ and the right of a universal Pastor, which it claims for itself" (Msi 40,399). See St. Zankow, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum* (1928) 68.84.90.91.138.139. L. Beauduin, *L'Eglise et les Eglises*, 1054-1954.
4. Fr. Heiler, *Altkirchliche Autonomie und Päpstlicher Zentralismus* (1941). For the opinions of other Ecumenists, who are cited, see *Etudes Oecuméniques: Documents de l'Assemblée d'Amsterdam*, I. *L'Eglise universel* (1949) p.23.53.106.197-263. O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952) 195-200.

by a law of strict succession, and they wish to define it as a merely human fact, from which the Roman Primacy is shown to have arisen naturally. A. Harnack attributes the origin of universal Primacy of the Roman Bishop especially to the influence of the City of Rome itself, which, since it was the real center and juridical head of the Roman Empire, was the reason which led gradually to acknowledging the Bishop of that city as the juridical head of the whole Church. But this recognition appears already sufficiently in history during the time of Victor I (ca. 190). In our time M. Goguel also holds similar views.

394. E. Caspar attributes the theory of the Roman Primacy to Tertullian and to St. Cyprian, holding that there is no certain historical evidence concerning this matter is to be found before them. R. Sohm thinks that in the edict of Callixtus (ca 220) a Roman Bishop for the first time attributed to himself the authority and succession of St. Peter. J. Turmel thinks that the author of the Primatial power was the Emperor Gratian when in the year 378 he decreed that the judgment concerning other Bishops should be reserved to the Roman Bishop, and with his imperial authority he commanded that the disciplinary decrees of the Roman Presider are to be held as binding by everyone. B.I. Kidd says that before St. Leo the Great there was existing in the Church a certain real Primacy of *direction only*, which then through St. Leo (ca. 450) became a true Primacy of jurisdiction. Finally, Παπαδόπουλος thinks that a Primacy of true jurisdiction was introduced into the Church in the 9th century because of the pseudo-Isidorian decrees. Others tried to find other human causes, to which in a similar way they could attribute the origin of the Primacy—all of them being driven by this one purpose, namely, so that they could deny its divine origin.⁵

395. Doctrine of the Church. The doctrine on the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff in a solemn judgment by the Church was defined especially in the Councils of *Lyons II*, *Florence* and *Vatican I* (D 861, 1307, 3056-3060).

a) *At the Council of Lyons*, in the year 1274, on union with the Greeks, the fact of the Primacy was defined: “the supreme and full Primacy”; the divine right of the Primacy: “which she received from the Lord himself in the person of Blessed Peter”; succession in the Primacy: “the chief or head

5. A. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte* (1909) 1,480-496; Id., *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1920) 157; M. Goguel, *Les premiers temps de l'Eglise* (1949) 218-225; E. Caspar, *Primatus Petri* (1927); Id., *Geschichte des Papstums* (1930); R. Sohm, *Kirchenrecht* (1923) 1,379f.; J. Turmel, *Histoire des Dogmes*: 3 La Papauté (1933); B.I. Kidd, *The Roman Primacy to A.D. 461* (1936); K. Guggisberg, *Matthäus 16,18-19 in der Kirchengeschichte*: ZKG 54 (1935) 276-300; Παπαδόπουλος, Το Προτεριον του 'Επισκοπου 'Ρωμης (1930). See M. Gordillo, *Un libro reciente*: OrChr 22 (1931) 180-191; H. Pierre, *L'union de l'Orient avec Rome*: OrChr 18 (1930) 1-156. See J. Haller, *Das Papsttum 1* (1950) 1-47.470f; see J.M. Sarabia, *Una nueva teoría sobre el origen del Primado*: Greg 17 (1936) 596-604; H.E. Feine, *Kirchliche Rechtsgeschichte*, I. Bd. *Die katholische Kirche* (1950) 48-56, 256-258.

of the Apostles, of whom the Roman Pontiff is the successor" (D 861).

396. b) *At the Council of Florence*, in the year 1493, on the union with the Orientals, in the decree for the Greeks, it was also defined: "that the Roman Pontiff holds the Primacy over the whole world"; in virtue of the succession: "that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of Blessed Peter, the head of the Apostles"; and this is by divine right: "and that to him, in the person of Blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding... the whole Church" (D 1307). The last words of this definition: "as is also contained in the acts of the ecumenical councils," some Gallicans interpreted in a restricted sense, as if it said: "according to that measure which was granted to it in the Councils"; but this arbitrary interpretation was rejected by the Fathers of the Vatican Council."⁶

397. c) *At the Vatican Council* the doctrine of the *Primacy of jurisdiction, by divine right, from the succession* of the Roman Pontiff in the place of St. Peter, was defined as an article of divine faith (D 3058). For a complete understanding of this definition, it is necessary to compare it with the first draft proposed to the Fathers of the Council:

First draft of the Canon

"If any one says that it is not according to the institution of Christ our Lord himself that blessed Peter in the Primacy over the whole Church should have perpetual successors; or that the Pontiff is not *by divine law* the successor of blessed Peter in the same Primacy: let him be anathema"
(Msi 51,552).

Revised and defined draft

"If any one says that it is not according to the institution of Christ our Lord himself, *or by divine right* that blessed Peter in the Primacy over the whole Church should have perpetual successors; or that the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of blessed Peter in the same Primacy: let him be anathema"
(Msi 52,1332).

398. As is evident, only the location of the words *by divine right* has been changed. This change was made according to the views of the Fathers and according to a correction proposed by Papp-Szilagyi Magno-Varadinensi, of the Romanian rite; because, as the Secretary for the faith declared, "if the words *by divine right* are left where they are (in the first draft), it could seem to agree with the assertion of those who say that the fact of Peter was only human; thus the Committee for the Faith accepts

6. Th. Granderath, *Constit. Dogmat. Conc. Vaticani* 150-154. See n.474.

the correction.”⁷ Therefore the change was made lest readers should think that the connection of the Primacy with the Roman See made by Peter was defined by the Council to be a matter of divine law.

399. Recent Roman Pontiffs have not ceased to vindicate this doctrine affirmed so openly in the Vatican Council with a solemn judgment, like Leo XIII in the Encyclical “*Sapientiae christianae*” (D 1936,a,c [34th ed.]) and in the Encyclical “*Satis cognitum*” (ASS 28,729-732). And in our days Pius XII said in the Encyclical “*Mystici Corporis*”: “But since the social body of the same Christ by the will of its Creator must be visible..., it is absolutely necessary that in the eyes of all the supreme Head should be seen, by whom the works of all might be directed in order to obtain the proposed end: we mean the Vicar of Jesus Christ on earth... Thus the divine Redeemer commanded Peter and his successors that while functioning as his visible presence on earth, they should also provide the visible governance of the Christian community” (AAS 35,227, see 210f.).

Theological note. Therefore the thesis is *a solemnly defined matter of divine faith, especially in Vatican Council I.*

400. Proof. In the perennial Primacy by divine law someone must always be the clear successor of St. Peter. But unless it is the Roman Pontiff, no one is. Therefore in the perennial Primacy by divine law the Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter.

The major is clear: a) Someone must *always* be there, because the Primacy is perennial. b) He must be *clearly* such, because the Primacy is the supreme power endowed with the office of teaching, sanctifying and governing men living in the common conditions of this life and united in a visible ecclesiastical society (see Pius XII, n.399).

The minor must be proved. The Roman Pontiff alone has always claimed the Primacy for himself and has been acknowledged by the Church as the successor of St. Peter. Therefore, unless it is the Roman Pontiff, no one is the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy.

401. The antecedent. 1) **The Roman Pontiff has claimed for himself the Primacy:** A) *in practice (exercite);* B) *in theory (signate).*

A) In practice he has always exercised *his authority over the other bishops* or over the whole Church; this certainly can be proved from innumerable documents of all times, as is recorded in the Archives of the

7. F.M. Zinelli, Episcopus Tarvisinus: Msi 52,1115.

Roman Pontiffs.⁸

For example:

St. Clement of Rome (ca. 96) in resolving the Corinthian schism (D 102).

St. Stephen (ca. 257) on the question of re-baptism (D 110-111).

St. Julius I (341) in his letter to the Antiochenes (D 132).

St. Siricius (385) in his letter to Bishop Himerius of Tarragona (D 181).

St. Innocent I (417) in his letter to the African Bishops (D 217; see also R 2014).

402. B) *In theory*, or in express words, especially since the 5th century, the Roman Pontiff claims for himself the Primacy.

For example:

St. Zosimus (418) to the Bishops of Africa, approving their teaching against the heresy of the Pelagians (D 221).

St. Boniface I (422) to Rufus and the other Bishops in Macedonia (D 234-235).

St. Celestine I (431) to the Bishops going to the Council of Ephesus (R 2018).

St. Leo the Great (446) to the Bishops of Vienna and Thessalonica (Kch 891-896).

St. Gelasius I (495) concerning the dignity of the Patriarchal Sees (D 350-351).

St. Hormisdas (517) on his famous formula signed by the Bishops of the East.

Pelagius I (560) writing to a schismatic Bishop (D 446).

Hadrian I (785) to the Patriarch Tarasius and to the Council of Nicaea II (D 298 [34th ed.]).

St. Nicholas I (865) to the Emperor Michael against Photius (D 640-642).

St. Leo IX (1053) against the schismatic Michael Cerularius (D 351-353 [34th

Clement VI (1351) to the Consolator Catholicos of the Armenians (D 1050-1058).

Benedict XIV (1743) Profession of Faith Prescribed for the Orientals (D 2540).

Pius IX (1864) against naturalism and communism (D 2895).

Many more testimonies could be cited in which the Roman Pontiffs have vindicated the Primacy for themselves *in practice* or *in theory*. We have referred to some of them that are mentioned in the *Compendium of Creeds*. One can add to them also Benedict XV (1917) in the *Code of Canon Law*, in which the Roman Primacy is clearly vindicated (CIC 218, 219); there is also the testimony of Pius VII (1801), who, in his Apostolic Letter "*Qui Christi Domini vices*," with one stroke deprived all the Bishops of France of all jurisdiction (BR [T] 35,215-228).

8. Ph. Jaffe, *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum* 1 (1885); G. Rauschen, *Textus antenicaeni ad Primatum Romanum spectantes*: *Florilegium Patristicum* 9 (1914); J. Madoz, *El Primado Romano*: Fuentes y Documentos (1936). See A.M. Stickler, *De Primatu romano historia collectionum Iuris Canonici illustrato*: *MonitEccles* 79 (1954) 409-425.

403. *The antecedent.* 2) **The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff was acknowledged by the Church:** A) *theoretically*; B) *practically*.

A) **Theoretically.** St. Ignatius the Martyr of Antioch (ca. 107) in his letter to the Romans, salutes the Roman Church, extolling it above others with magnificent epithets, whereby he implicitly acknowledges its singular preeminence (R 52). This salutation not only in its solemnity, but also in its special form, far surpasses the other salutations with which St. Ignatius praises the other Churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia and Smyrna.⁹

St. Ignatius especially expresses the preeminence of the Roman Church, when he says: "Which presides in the place of the region of the Romans... presiding in charity, having the law of Christ, signed with the name of the Father." Above all, two sentences must be explained, which in Greek are the following: προκάθεται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων, and προκαθήμενὴ τῆς ἀγάπης.

404. There are two main tendencies in the interpretation of these expressions: 1) The view of those, *especially non-Catholics*, who interpret more broadly the meaning of the word προκάθῃσθαι, but the word ἀγάπη more strictly; hence they conclude that St. Ignatius is testifying only that the Roman Church is eminent in virtue and in works of charity. This interpretation was defended by Zahn, Lightfoot and essentially also by Harnack.¹⁰ 2) The view of those, *generally Catholics*, who interpret the word προκάθῃσθαι strictly, but the word ἀγάπη more broadly; hence they infer that St. Ignatius is testifying that the Roman Church governs the assembly of charity, that is, the whole Church of Christ. For this interpretation the following can be consulted: Funk, Wilmers, Chapmann, Zapelena, and others.¹¹

405. Therefore the opinions are to be so interpreted that as faithfully as possible they might render the meaning intended by St. Ignatius, which, it seems to us, J. Thielen has explained very well.¹² Therefore a) προκάθῃσθαι by the basic force of the verb, in both profane and sacred use, and in the writings of Ignatius himself, in the cited places, has its own meaning: namely, it means *to preside, to rule over*, as in the letter to the

9. F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* 1,212-313.

10. Th. Zahn, *Ignatius von Antiochien* (1873); Id., *Patrum Apostolicorum opera: Ignatii epistolae* (1876); J.B. Lightfoot, *Apostolic Fathers: S. Ignatius* (1885); A. Harnack, *Das Zeugnis des Ignatius über das Ansehen der römischen Gemeinde: SitzBPAkadWiss* (1896) 111-131.

11. J. Chapmann, *S. Ignace et l'Eglise Romaine*: RevBén 15 (1896) 385-400; F.X. Funk, *Kirchengeschichte Abhandlungen und Untersuchungen* 1 (1897) 1-12; Van Laak, *Instit. Theol. Fundam. De Ecclesia* (1911) n.108-113; I. Ottiger, *De Ecclesia* 626-630; G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.123; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.10 (1950) 287-294.

12. J. Thielen, *Vorrang in der Liebe. Eine Untersuchung über προκαθήμενὴ τῆς ἀγάπης*: ThGl 19 (1927) 701-709; Pius XII, *Solenne udienza dei Parrochi di Roma*: "St. Ignatius gave to the Church of Rome the title of προκαθήμενὴ τῆς ἀγάπης: it is an expression in which, among other things, an honorable and noble recognition is manifested concerning the charity of that Church, that is to say, that she "has the primacy (also) in charity" (*L'Ossevatore Romano*, Feb. 7, 1940) (translation from Italian by KB).

Magnesians: “to the Bishop presiding προκαθήμενου in the place of God”; b) Ἀγάπη is a word, which in St. Ignatius, within the proper signification of the word, has a *fuller meaning*. For, under that word St. Ignatius comprehends everything that pertains to the Christian life, and indeed under all its aspects whether social, or doctrinal, or spiritual, or religious manifested especially in the Eucharistic worship. Hence it is clear that with the word ἀγάπη St. Ignatius understands *also* the assembly of the faithful, which he says expressly in his letters to the Trallians 3,2; 13,1; to the Romans 9,3; to the Philadelphians 11,2.¹³ It should be noted that προκαθήσθαι is constructed with the genitive case signifying either the place or the assembly over which the governance is being exercised, otherwise it signifies absolutely and in an indefinite manner to govern.

406. Therefore a) the sentence of St. Ignatius, προκαθίσθαι ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων, signifies that the Roman Church “Presides in the place of the region of the Romans.” That is, the Roman Church presides absolutely and in an indefinite manner *without a limitation of place*, because ἐν τόπῳ designates a place, not *in which*, because it is not in the genitive case, but *from which* it exercises its governance.

407. Therefore b) the expression of St. Ignatius, προκαθιμένη τῆς ἀγάπης, means that the Roman Church “is the presider in love, or *governs the whole Christian life*,” not just the social and juridical, but also the doctrinal, sacramental, liturgical, etc. That is, the Roman Church simply and with no limitations governs the faithful of Christ.

408. But c) St. Ignatius says expressly that “there is no Church without a Bishop” (R 49, 65). Therefore it is to be concluded that he attributes this power to the Roman Bishop. Nevertheless absolutely and in an indefinite manner he asserts this of the Roman Church, because such great authority belongs to the Roman Bishop, not by reason of the Episcopate, but by reason of the succession of St. Peter in the Apostolic See, of which he is the Bishop (see R 54).

409. *It is confirmed* that St. Ignatius teaches the primatial authority of the Roman Bishop: because he says that “he has the law of Christ” (R 52); but this agrees with the early Christian monuments, in which the conferring of the Primacy is signified by the figure of Christ giving the law to St. Peter. b) Because he acknowledges that the power of “teaching, commanding and governing” other Churches belongs to the Roman Church (R 53, 55). c) Because he says that the Roman Church “is marked with the name of the Father,” and this means, in the style of St. Ignatius, that it is notable for its supreme preeminence.

Conclusion: Therefore, in the things that St. Ignatius writes, an implicit acknowledgment of the Primacy of the Roman Church is contained, because without any limitation of places and persons he says that the Roman Church has the governance of the whole life of Christians.

13. F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* 1 p.244.250.262.274.

410. 2) St. Irenaeus (ca. 180) testifies that the supreme authority of the Church belongs to the Roman See by reason of its doctrine. But in the Church of Christ there is one supreme authority covering all situations. Therefore, St. Irenaeus implicitly testifies that the supreme authority of the Church belongs to the Roman See covering all situations.

The major is proved because St. Irenaeus holds as an axiom that the consensus of the whole Church in matters of doctrine possesses the greatest authority (R 209, 210). But he asserts further that the consensus of the whole Church *necessarily* is equivalent to the testimony of the Roman Church alone (R 210, 213). Therefore, St. Irenaeus testifies that the supreme authority of the Church belongs to the Roman See by reason of its doctrine.

411. Concerning the *necessity* which we assert in the minor, St. Irenaeus expresses it in these words: "For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority" (R 210). Now such necessity, according to the various opinions of the authors, can be understood as either *moral* or *logical*. If St. Irenaeus is affirming moral necessity, then he is holding that the whole Church is morally obligated to agree with the Roman Church; but if he is affirming logical necessity, then he is holding from the doctrine of the Roman Church with logical necessity that it is to be inferred that it is the same doctrine of the whole Church, which cannot be the case unless it is supposed that the authority of the Roman Church is equal to the authority of the whole Church. Therefore, in the first case formally, in the second case equivalently, St. Irenaeus is testifying that the authority of the Roman See is supreme.¹⁴

412. 3) Tertullian (ca. 210) acknowledges in general the singular eminence and fullness of the Roman Church (R 297). Also he confesses that a decision made by the Roman Bishop is acknowledged by the whole Church (Kch 218). Finally, once he became a Montanist, he tried to persuade himself that the Primacy over the whole Church was a personal privilege granted by Christ to Peter alone (R 387).

413. 4) St. Cyprian (ca. 252), while defending the unity of the Church against the schismatics, says: "there is one Church and one Chair founded on Peter by the voice of the Lord," and he calls the Roman see "the Chair of Peter and the principal Church, from which priestly unity took its origin" (R 573-575, 580). St. Cyprian uses terminology like this in his treatise *De Ecclesiae unitate* (R 555).

The authors do not agree on determining accurately the teaching of St. Cyprian

14. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.754f.771; D. van de Eynde, *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien* (1933) 165-187; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia*, loc.cit., 295-308.

regarding the Roman Primacy. At least it can be said that he theoretically professes that the Roman Bishop, because of the succession of Peter, is the source and center of unity. On the fullness of the primatial power he does not seem to have attained it total force; but always he presupposes and teaches that a prerogative derived from St. Peter belongs to the Roman See, which cannot be attributed to any other See, in virtue of which Catholic unity depends to such an extent on the Roman Bishop that it can be obtained only through him, from him and with him.¹⁵

414. 5) *An anonymous author against players with dice* (ca. 260) clearly expresses the idea of the Primacy when he says: "The divine and paternal piety gave us the guidance of the Apostolate and ordained the vicarious Chair of the Lord with heavenly dignity, and in our superior we carry the origin of the authentic Apostolate, upon whom Christ established the Church, when at the same time he received the power of binding and loosing" (Kch 310).

6) St. Optatus Milevitanus in Africa and Prudentius in Spain (ca. 370) profess the same doctrine. St. Optatus (R 1242). But Prudentius writes: "Give, O Christ, to your Romans,—May it be a Christian city:—Through which you have given as to the others—One mind regarding holy things.—Let all members come together—And so become a symbol." And elsewhere: "May the one faith thrive which was established in the primitive temple,—Which Paul retains and which the chair of Peter guards."¹⁶

415. 7) St. Jerome (ca. 376), having been asked about the schism in Antioch, in which St. Basil defended the party of Meletius, but on the other side St. Athanasius defended the rights of Paulinus, responded in a letter to Pope Damasus: "I associate in communion with the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church was built on that rock. Whoever eats a lamb outside of this house is a pagan... I do not know Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I do not know Paulinus. Whoever does not gather with you, scatters" (R 1346). The testimonies of St. Ambrose (R 1261) and of St. Augustine (R 1507) can also be consulted.

15. M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.300; J. Chapman, *Studies on the Early Papacy: St. Cyprian on the Church* (1928) c.2; P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (1938) 135-150; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* I (1950) 313-343; E. Caspar, *Geschichte des Papsttums* I (1930) 72-79, exaggerates when he holds that St. Cyprian was the inventor of the theory of the Roman Primacy; P. Batiffol, *L'Eglise naissante et le Catholicisme* (1927) c.8 excus.E p.440-447; O. Perler, *Le "De unitate" de S.Cyprien interprété par S.Augustin: Augustinus Magister* (1954) 835-858.

16. For the testimony of Prudentius, see Z. García-Villada, *Historia ecclesiastica de España* 1,1 p.221. There are other testimonies of the Spanish Church in A.C. Vega, *El Primado Romano en la Iglesia española desde sus orígenes hasta el siglo VII*; also in J. Madoz, *El Primado Romano en España en el siglo isidoriano*: both are in *RevEspT* 2 (1942) 63-99, 229-255.

416. B) The primacy acknowledged in practice. 1) In Ecumenical Councils:

a) In the Council of *Ephesus*, in the case of Nestorius, under Celestine I (a.431; D 3056).

b) In the Council of *Chalcedon*, against the Monophysites, under Leo I the Great (a.451; D 293 and 306).¹⁷

c) In the Council of *Lateran IV*, in the case of the Waldensians and Albigensians, under Innocent III (a.1215; D 811).

d) In the Council of *Lyons II*, on union of the Greeks, under Gregory X (a.1272; D 861).

e) In the Council of *Florence*, on the union of the Orientals, under Eugene IV (a.1439; D 1307).

f) In the Council of *Lateran V*, on restoring morals and discipline in the Church, under Leo X (a.1516; D 1445).¹⁸

g) In the Council of *Vatican I*, on the Catholic faith and on the Church, under Pius IX (a. 1870; D 3056-3059).

417. 2) On various questions on the occasion of controversies:

a) In the *Corinthian schism* (ca.96), St. Clement of Rome imposes submission by reason of his primatial authority. For, while St. John the Apostle is still living and also the disciples of St. Paul, the founder of the Corinthian Church, St. Clement writes to the Apostolic Church, and he does it not having been asked but moved by his office; he sharply reprimands them, imposes obedience, and demands it through the legates whom he sends (D 102; R 25, 27, 29). But St. Dionysius of Corinth (ca.170) and Clement of Alexandria testify that the letter was written by St. Clement, and that the Church in Corinth obeyed him, with the result that with great reverence the same letter frequently was read in the church, almost as if it were sacred Scripture. Therefore, the apostolic Church of Corinth in practice acknowledged the primatial authority of the Roman Bishop.¹⁹

418. In the controversy about the day of Easter (ca.190), St. Victor, the Roman Bishop, gave directions on when it was to be celebrated by

17. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.286-293 and 308, where the arguments derived from the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon* are amply explained. Pius XII, "Sempiternus Rex": AAS 43 (1951) 631ff.: "The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff was clearly manifested by the serious Christological controversy of faith" (*loc.cit.*, 626). A. Grillmeier-H.Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* 2 vol. (1951-1953)

18. *The Council of Trent* in its whole way of operating clearly presupposes the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, as is maintained by Ph. Alonso-Bárcena, *El Primado Romano en el Conc. De Trento*: RazFe 131 (1945) 397-428. See H. Grisar, *Die Frage des Päpstlichen Primats auf dem Tridentinum*: ZkathTh 8 (1884) 453-507; G. Glez, *Primauté*: DTC 13,319-327.

19. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* I (1950) 279-287, where the interpretation of the testimony of St. Clement, which was proposed by R. van Cauwelaert in *RevHistEccl* 31 (1931) 267-305, is refuted.

the Churches. From the Acts of the Councils he knew that Easter was celebrated almost everywhere according to the Roman custom, that is, on the first Sunday that occurs after the 14th day of the month of Nisam, received according to tradition from the Apostles. However, he learned that only the Churches of Asia celebrated Easter two days after the 14th day of the month of Nisam, according to a tradition which they said came from the Apostle John. With this in mind, St. Victor decreed that the whole Church should celebrate Easter according to the Roman custom, and the Churches of Asia thinking otherwise "he declared to be alienated from the unity of the Church" (Kch 97, 100). But no one at that time denied to St. Victor this right of making such an authoritative decree, although some, like St. Irenaeus, wanted to dissuade him from carrying out this decree. Therefore, in practice at that time, the primatial authority of the Roman Bishop was acknowledged.²⁰

419. c) In the question about *re-baptizing heretics* (ca.257) St. Stephen, the Roman Bishop, with his primatial authority decreed what must be held. For, at Carthage under Agrippinus (ca.220), at Caesarea in Cappadocia under Firmilian (ca.230), and finally under St. Cyprian at Carthage (ca.255-256), *five Councils of Bishops* were held, and over the last three St. Cyprian presided. These five Councils declared the baptisms of heretics invalid. Wherefore *St. Cyprian asked for a definitive confirmation of the conciliar decision from St. Stephen, the Roman Bishop*. But St. Stephen answered authoritatively: "Let nothing be introduced except what has already been handed down" (D 110). In the same sense he wrote to Bishop Firmilian and he threatened to break communion with him because he was re-baptizing heretics (D 111; Kch 309). But finally all followed the decision of St. Stephen, although at the beginning, because of practical difficulties, its execution was somewhat impeded. Therefore in practice the primatial authority of St. Stephen was recognized.

420. d) *In an appeal to the Roman Bishop* against a decision of the synods, Bishop Basilides was deposed from his See of Asturia by a synod of Spanish Bishops (ca. 256). St. Stephen, the Roman Bishop, accepts the recourse of Basilides and "orders him to be restored to the Episcopate from which he had been deposed." Then the Spanish Bishops turned to St. Cyprian, not seeking a decision, but only that he might be for them "either comfort or assistance." St. Cyprian replies that the carrying out of Stephen's decision should be deferred, until the Roman Bishop could

20. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.524, on the controversy about the day of Easter.

be more fully informed about the truth of the facts of the case. Hence it is clear that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was acknowledged even to make a decision contrary to a synodal decree of the Bishops of other provinces.²¹

421. e) *In the Arian controversies* (a.325-381) many indications of the Roman Primacy are evident; if they are all taken together with difficult circumstances of things and persons, they certainly provide a convincing argument.

In the first ecumenical Council, Nicaea I (a.325), St. Sylvester I presides through his legates, although the more than 300 Bishops present, gathered together in order to judge the case of Arius, were almost all Orientals. In this Council "the Catholic Church anathematized" the Arians (D 125-126), and thereby its ecumenical nature is clearly signified.

Both contending sides appealed to St. Julius I (ca.341). But the Pontiff, after having examined the case, annulled the decree of the council of Antioch, rejected the Arian accusations against St. Athanasius by decrees published in the Councils of Rome and Serdica (a. 341 and 343) in which he also reserved to himself the right to decide the cases of Bishops (D 132-136).

422. St. Liberius, afflicted by numberless vexations from the Emperor Constantius and from the Arians, finally after the death of the Emperor (a.361) and having returned from exile, officially condemned the Arian formula published in Constantinople (a.360) and he absolved and received back the 59 Bishops who had denied the faith (a.366).

St. Damasus (a.369) condemned the semi-Arian council of Rimini (a.359), and he promulgated a formula of faith that had to be subscribed by all the Bishops in the Orient; by subscribing it, the Bishops acknowledged the authority of the Primacy of St. Damasus. The Emperor Theodosius (a.380) promulgated an Edict on the Catholic faith in favor of St. Damasus (Kch 828).

423. *In the second ecumenical Council, Constantinople I* (a.381), the Bishops of the Orient solemnly professed the formula of faith published against the Arians in the Council of Nicaea I (a.325), and they perfected it against the Macedonians (D 150-151). For this reason, under St. Damasus the question raised by Arius was finally put to rest, and because of that the practical recognition of the Primacy of the Roman Bishop was made clear.²²

424. f) *In the Priscillian controversy* (a.380-447), the Primatial authority of the Roman Bishop, in practice recognized by the Spanish Bishops, can easily be shown.

St. Damasus (a.380) responded to the Spanish Bishops and Priscillian, who had

21. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 67: CSEL 3,2,735: ML 3,1057. See Z. García-Villada, *loc.cit.*, p.215ff.

22. For a similar reason it can be argued from the controversies with the *Meletians, Pelagians and Nestorians*: see M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.305-308.

appealed to him, that it is not allowed to condemn anyone as guilty, who was not first heard in a court of judgment. Both sides recognized the authority of St. Damasus to decide this case, although several Spanish Bishops thought that this was not necessary.

St. Siricius (a.396), on the revival of Priscillianism, when the Bishops of the Council of Saragossa asked him for a definite remedy for it, answered them by more accurately determining the conditions for the abjuration and absolution of the Priscillianists.

425. St. Innocent I (a.404) rejected the recourse to him of the Bishops against the Priscillianists, who had been reconciled according to the form of St. Siricius; he reconfirmed the former decision of St. Siricius and officially condemned those who refused to submit themselves to him.

St. Leo I (a.447) responded to the Bishops appealing to him against the Priscillianists who were increasing everywhere: *He condemns Priscillianism with sixteen articles*, and *he commands* that, when Councils have been convened in Spain, all the Bishops are to subscribe the formula sent by him. By obeying the mandates of St Leo, in practice the Bishops acknowledge the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff.²³

426. g) *In questions about discipline of the Church of Tarragona*, St. Siricius (a.385), as the successor of St. Peter in the Roman See, replies authoritatively to the questions proposed to his predecessor St. Damasus by Bishop Himerius of Tarragona, and with authority he decrees and ordains several things, which pertain to the reformation and discipline of the Spanish Churches (D 181-185).

From what we have just said we can now conclude: that the Primacy of the Roman Bishop, on the occasion of controversies concerning various questions, in practice and clearly was acknowledged by the Church.²⁴

427. Scholium 1. THE ROMAN PONTIFF BY DIVINE LAW HAS PRIMACY OVER THE CHURCH.

23. See Z. García-Villada, *Hist. Eccles. de España* 1,1, p.224-228.

24. H. Scott, *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy* (1928) 350f., although he is an Anglican, he expresses the conclusion of the whole work by saying: "At least since the year 180 until 891 the whole Church believed unanimously that Christ conferred on St. Peter over the other Apostles the same authority which the Roman Pontiffs have, as true successors of St. Peter." F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 220-223, proves the Roman Primacy of authority from the Councils, Fathers and Liturgies. Recently the Protestant R. Baumann, *Des Petrus Bekenntnis und Schlüssel* (1950), acknowledges that Christ in Matt. 16:17-19 constituted Peter the fundamental rock of his Church, and that his office is going to continue in Peter's successors until the end of the world. He concludes: The Gospel is valid for all times: In this matter are we evangelicals obedient to the Gospel or not? (pp.34-36.39.48.105.143.154-157.177.228). See De Grasso: *CivCatt* (1951,4) 637-650. The Anglican historian T.G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (London 1944), very much agrees with the historical conclusions of Catholic authors regarding the primacy of the Roman Pontiff.

427. Scholium 1. THE ROMAN PONTIFF BY DIVINE RIGHT REGARDING THE PRIMACY OF THE CHURCH

1) claims it for himself....
 { A) Practically
 { B) Expressly

2) and his Primacy is acknowledged...
 { A) Theoretically
 { B) Practically: 1.^o in Councils 2.^o in controversies

1) A)

- ca.96 St. Clement of Rome (D 102).
- ca.257 St. Stephen I (D 110f).
- a.341 St. Julius I (D 132).
- a.385 St. Siricius (D 181).
- a.417 St. Innocent I (D 217; R 2014).

1) B)

- a.418 St. Zosimus (D 221).
- a.422 St. Boniface I (D 946-951)
- a.431 St. Celestine I (R 2018).
- a.446 St. Leo the Great (Kch 891 896).
- a.495 St. Gelasius I (D 350-351).
- a.517 St. Hormisdas (D 363-364).
- a.560 Pelagius I (D 446).
- a.785 Hadrian I (D 298 [34th ed.]).
- a.865 St. Nicholas I (D 640).
- a.1053..St. Leo IX (D 351-353 [34th ed.]).
- a.1351 Clement VI (D 1054-1059).
- a.1743 Benedict XIV (D 2540).
- a.1864 Pius IX (D 2895)

2) A)

- ca.107 St. Ignatius (R 52-55).
- ca.180 St. Irenaeus (R 209f 213).
- ca.210 Tertullian (R 297; Kch 218 bis).
- ca.252 St. Cyprian (R 555 573-75).
- ca.260 Anonymous (Kch 310).
- ca.370 Optatus Milevit. (R 1242).
- ca.375 Prudentius (Hymn 2,233; 9,30).
- ca.376 St. Jerome (R 1346).
- ca.395 St. Ambrose (R 1261).
- ca.417 St. Augustine (R 1307).

2) B) 1.^o

- a.431 Council of Ephesus (D 3056).
- a.451 Council of Chalcedon (D 293 306).
- a.870 Council of Constant. IV (D 363-364).
- a.1215 Council of Lateran IV (D 811).
- a.1272 Council of Lyons II (D 861).
- a.1439 Council of Florence (D 1307).
- a.1516 Council of Lateran V (D 1445-1447).
- a.1870 Council of Vat. I (D 3056-3059).

2) B) 2.^o

- ca.96 Schism of Corinth (R 25 27 29).
- ca.177 Montanism (Eus. HE v.3,4).
- ca.190 on the day of Easter (Kch 97.100).
- ca.255 on re-baptism (D 110; Kch 309).
- ca.256 on the case of Basilidis (Cyp. Ep.667).
- a.325-381 on the Arian heresy.
- a.325 under Sylv. I Council of Nicaea I (D 125).
- ca.341 under Julius I (D 133-136).
- a.381 Council of Constant. I (D 151).
- a.517 Acacian schism (D 363f).
- a.380-447 on the errors of Priscillian.
- a.380 under St. Damasus.
- a.396 under St. Siricius.
- a.404 under St. Innocent I.
- a.447 under St. Leo I the Great.
- a.385 on the discipline of Terraconensis.

428. Scholium 2. *The proof of the Primacy is independent of the fact and of the right of the Roman episcopacy of Peter.* First of all, it should be noted that the demonstration of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, which we have given, is completely independent both of the fact of Peter's dwelling in Rome, and of the right by which St. Peter attached the Primacy to the Roman Episcopate. St. Robert Bellarmine developed and used this way of proving it, and Pius XI recommended his teaching when he wrote: "It is the outstanding praise of St. Robert that he both irrefutably proved and learnedly defended against the adversaries the rights and privileges divinely conferred on the Supreme Pontiff. Because of this, even in our time he has remained such a defender of the authority of the Roman Pontiff that the Fathers of *Vatican Council I* made great use of his writings and opinions. And actually, the *Vatican Council* commended his way of proving the Primacy, and at the Council the Fathers, relying on the authority of St. Bellarmine, often insisted that the question of the succession in the Primacy is independent of the fact and of the right of the Roman episcopacy of St. Peter."²⁵

429. Scholium 3. St. Peter lived in Rome and suffered martyrdom there.

See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.484-496. H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (1927). Id., *Petrus römischer Märtyrer* (1936); A.St. Barnes, *The Martyrdom of St. Paul* (1933); O. Marucchi, *Pietro e Paolo à Roma* (1934); U. Holzmeister, *Comment. In epist. I Petr* (1937); B. Altaner, *War Petrus in Rom?*: ThRev 36 (1937) 177-188; E. Metzner, *Die Petrus Tradition und ihre neuesten Gegner* (1937); C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa e le Chiese* (1944) 160; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen (1945) th.34; *Esplosioni sotto la Confessione di S.Pietro* (1951) I p.2 c.2; *La memoria apostolica*, p. 119-144; E. Kirschbaum: StZt 144 (1949) 292-303; 150 (1952) 321-332, 401-410; O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre* (1952).

430. *The Roman sojourn of St. Peter and his martyrdom in the City* are facts that pertain to ecclesiastical history. Especially the authors of the school of form-criticism of Tübingen (Baur, Strauss, Zeller, and others), along with many ancient Protestants, denied these facts. More recently, namely in the 20th century, these facts have generally been admitted even by non-Catholics (Hilgenfeld, Weizsäcker, Harnack, Lietzmann, Caspar, and others). However in recent decades some non-Catholics again have defended the negative opinion (Bauer, Haller, Heussi, and others).²⁶

431. *The principle testimonies*, by which the Roman sojourn of St. Peter is demonstrated historically, are customarily given as the following: St. Peter : 1 Pet. 5:13; see Rev. 14:8; 16:19; 17:5.9; Col. 4:10; Philem. 24. St. Mark, a disciple of St. Peter (1 Pet. 5:13), who lived in Rome ca. 60-63 (Col. 4:10; Philem. 24), having been asked urgently by the Romans, wrote his Gospel according to the preaching which the Romans had heard personally from St. Peter, as Papias attests (Kch 426f.; see R 652). St. Clement (ca.96) Cor. 5,4 (R 11). St. Ignatius (ca. 107) Rom. 4,3 (R 54). St. Dionysius of Corinth (ca. 170) (Kch 60). Gaius the Presbyter (ca. 200) (Kch 137, 138). St. Irenaeus (ca. 200) (R 208, 210). Clement of Alexandria (ca. 210) (R 439). Tertullian (ca. 200) (R 297, 341;

25. Pius XI, Apostolic Letter "*Providentissimus Deus*": ASS 23 (1931) 435-436; St. R. Bellarmine, *Controv.* 3 l.2 c.12; Msi 51,552.969.972; 52,10.31.1097.1115. 1118.1307.

26. See Ch. Pesch, *Praelectiones dogmaticae* I n.465-476; B. Altaner, *War Petrus in Rom?*: ThRev 36 (1937) 177ff.; E. Kirschbaum, *Die Ausgrabungen unter der Petruskirche in Rom*: StZt 144 (1949) 292-303; *Das Petrusgrab*: StZt 150 (1952) 321-332, 401-410.

Kch 216). Origen (ca. 250) (Kch 428). In these testimonies the martyrdom of St. Peter is mentioned by St. Clement, St. Dionysius, Gaius the Presbyter, Tertullian and Origen.

432. However, innumerable archeological monuments *confirm this testimony*; in Rome they show St. Peter preaching the Gospel to the Romans, or using his staff so that waters pour forth from a rock, which the Romans drink. But that St. Peter died in Rome is proved by what was found recently in the catacombs near the Basilica of St. Sebastian on the Via Appia; from these archeologists conclude that they have found bodies buried there before the year 258 or a memorial that was celebrated of Saints Peter and Paul. For, on the walls there are about 200 written names and invocations of the Apostles; in this way traveling Christians honored their memory in that place.²⁷ But the existence in the Vatican of the primitive tomb of St. Peter seems to have been proved by the investigation of experts; there was found the "Monument" of Peter which is mentioned by Gaius (Kch 138): *Esplorazioni sotto la Confessione di S. Pietro* (1951) I p.119-144.

433. Scholium 4. The Roman Episcopacy of St. Peter.

I. Ottiger, *De Ecclesia* th.16 p.574-594; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* th.15 n.511-541; H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* th.20 n.497-506; P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (1938), *Natale Petri de Cathedra* 399-404.

All non-Catholics since the middle of the 19th century have denied unanimously *the Roman Episcopate of St. Peter*, which is easily inferred from what we said in thesis 8 about the Bishops as the successors of the Apostles. Of them, Lightfoot, Harnack and Caspar are the ones who have proposed the more serious difficulties against the Roman Episcopate of St. Peter.²⁸

434. *Vatican Council I* seems to suppose the fact of the Roman Episcopate of St. Peter, but it does not treat it expressly (see D. 3056-3057). Indeed we know this: 1) *that St. Peter is the Apostle*, or the immediate continuer of the mission of Christ; 2) *that the same St. Peter is the Primate*, or the only supreme Vicar of Christ over the whole Church; 3) *that he lived in Rome* and preached the Gospel there. From this 3) it does not immediately follow *that he was the Bishop of Rome*, or that he reserved to himself the administration of the particular Roman Church; *and not be reason of the Apostolate*, because St. Paul the Apostle also stayed in Rome and preached the Gospel to the Romans, although he is not properly called a Roman Bishop; *and not by reason of the Primacy*, because the Avignon Popes also had the Primacy, but without by that very fact always reserving to themselves the Avignon Episcopacy.²⁹

435. Therefore the Roman Episcopate of St. Peter is a fact, which must be proved

27. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.494-495; H. Lietzmann, *Petrus und Paulus in Rom* (1927) c.10 p.145-168; Id., *Petrus römischer Märtyrer* (1936).

28. I.B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers I* (1890) 501ff.; A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristliche Literatur: Chronologie* (1904) 1,703ff.; E. Caspar, *Die älteste römische Bischofsliste* (1926).

29. See C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi* (1913) 123, *Avinionen* note 10.

with positive arguments. It is proved especially from the catalogue of the Roman Bishops, which has come down to us. Hegesippus (ca. 160: R 188); St. Irenaeus (ca. 180: R 210f.; see Kch 117, 126); Tertullian (ca. 200: R 296); Hippolytus (ca. 220: Dieckmann n.503); St. Cyprian (ca. 252: R 575, 580); Eusebius Caesariensis (ca. 300: Kch 421); *Catalogus Liberianus* (a. 354: Kch 545); *Poema adv. Marcionem* (ca. 365: R 897); Optatus Milevitanus (ca. 370: R 1242); St. Epiphanius (ca. 375: R 1092); St. Jerome (ca. 377: R 1346); St. Augustine (ca. 400: R 1418); St. Peter Chrysologus (ca. 449: R 2178); see *Liber Pontificalis* (ca. 530: Kch 1003f.).

436. Because of these testimonies the following say, either formally or equivalently, that St. Peter was the Bishop of Rome: St. Cyprian, *Poema adv. Marcionem*, St. Epiphanius, Eusebius, *Catalogus Liberianus*, Optatus Milevitanus, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Peter Chrysologus, *Liber Pontificalis*. Elsewhere St. Jerome says: "Clement was the fourth Bishop of Rome after Peter and Linus was the second; hence the first Bishop was Peter."³⁰ The others must be said to be implicit testimonies, namely, those of Hegesippus, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus; although St. Irenaeus says in one place that Hyginus was the ninth Bishop, which supposes that St. Peter was the first (Kch 117), but in another place he calls Hyginus the eighth Bishop (Kch 126).

437. It is true that the most ancient catalogues do not number St. Peter among the Roman Bishops, writing that the first Bishop after St. Peter was Linus; but this does not deny that St. Peter was the Bishop, since the succession takes its beginning from him; this signifies only that St. Peter in some sense is above the order of the others, because he was the founder of the Roman Chair, the First and an Apostle.

The adversaries insist that the ancient testimonies say that St. Peter and St. Paul were both founders of the Roman Church, and hence that they both are to be considered the Bishops, as Epiphanius expressly says: "Peter and Paul, the Apostles, both together were the first Bishops of Rome" (R 1092). In answer to this it is necessary to say that all the other testimonies that we have cited say that the succession of the Episcopal Chair begins with Peter, but that St. Epiphanius wanted, in that place, to establish the apostolic origin of the Roman succession, and that he did not use the word "bishop" in the technical sense, but only etymologically.

But Tertullian, who speaks accurately and juridically, mentions St. Peter alone when he says: "Clement of the Romans was ordained by Peter" (R 296).

438. Finally, the Roman Episcopacy of St. Peter can be proved from archeological monuments, from which it is apparent that St. Peter was regarded as the true Bishop of the Roman See, and that his relationship to the particular Roman Church is in every way special—in a way that does not belong to St. Paul.³¹

30. St. Jerome, *De viris illustribus* c.15: ML 23,663.

31. See H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.505.

439. Scholium 5. On the nature of the right by which St. Peter joined the Primacy to the Roman Episcopate.

S.Th. III, q. 35, a.7 ad 3; Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.3 n.10; *Defensio fidei* l.3 c.13 n.11; St. R. Bellarmine, *De Romano Pontifice* l.2 c.12; l.4 c.4; Franzelin, th.12 p.200-220; I. Ottiger, *De Ecclesia* 864-870; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontific* th.10; J. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.393-399; J. Hollswcek, *Der apostolische Stuhl und Rom. Eine Untersuchung über die rechtliche Natur der Verbindung des Primates mit der Sedes Romana* (1895).

440. 1) In this matter the opinion of Tamburini, Febronius and Nuytzi is *erroneous* and cannot be held by any Catholic; they hold that the connection of the Primacy with the Roman See is such by a merely human law, so that also *independently of the authority of the Supreme Pontiff* it could be moved. Pius IX expressly condemned this opinion (D 2935).

441. 2) *There are three opinions on this matter*, about which Catholics dispute freely. In the Acts of Vatican Council I it is described in this way³²: "It is to be noted that these opinions are reduced to three. The *first* one holds that Peter, *by a command of Christ*, joined the Primacy to the Roman See; therefore it concludes that not even the Roman Pontiff could separate the Primacy from the Roman Episcopacy: this is the opinion of Cajetan, Melchior Cano, Gregory de Valencia and other important theologians.³³ The *second opinion* holds that the Primacy is annexed to the Roman See *by ecclesiastical law*; hence it concludes that, for just reasons, one can be separated from the other by the Supreme Pontiff; Soto, Báñez and others hold this view.³⁴

442. The *third opinion*, finally, is that of those who hold that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter, *regarding the Primacy by divine law, regarding the Roman See by ecclesiastical law*; but because Peter himself at the same time exercised the Primacy together with the Roman Episcopate, he joined one to the other in such a way that both the Roman Episcopacy and the Headship of the whole Church are one and the same thing... and so the Roman Episcopate must be had only as a condition for succession by divine law in the Primacy; from this fact of Peter they infer that the Primacy and the Roman Episcopacy *have become absolutely inseparable*: Perrone collects and explains this opinion taken from other theologians.³⁵ The Secretary L. Pie, Bishop of Poitiers, in the same Council proposed this same opinion when he said: "But from the fact of St. Peter

32. Msi 52,1268.1307.

33. Cajetan, *De potestate papae* c.13f.; M. Cano, *De locis* l.6 c.4 c.8 and 10; G. de Valencia, *De analysi fidei* l.7 c.12; Id., *De fide* q.1 punct.7 § 38; Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.3 n.10; St. R. Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pontifice* l.4 c.4; Tanner, *De fide* d.1 q.4 dub.4; C. Mazzella, *De Ecclesia* d.5 a.2 § 5; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontifice* th.9f.; De Groot, *De Ecclesia* q.15 a.5; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* th.16 n.548-575; I. Ottiger, *De Ecclesia* p.864-870; L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* q.14 th.28; G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.145f.; J. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.393-399; M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.319; R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.45 n.5; L. Lercher, *De Ecclesia* (1927) n.374-378; (1945) n.364-368.

34. D. Soto, *In 4 Sent.* d.24 q.2 a.5; D. Báñez, *Comment.* in II-II, q.1, a.10 (Salamanca 1584) 322-325; Ballerini, *De potestate Ecclesiae* p.2 c.8; I. Mendive, *De principiis Theologiae* tr.2 diss.1 c.3 a.3.

35. J. Perrone, *Tract. de locis theol.* P.1 s.2 c.2 th.3 n.572-602; John of St. Thomas, *Curs. Theol. De auct. S.Pontif.* a.4 n.9; I.B. Franzelin, *De Ecclesia* th.12 p.200-220; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* I (1950) 385-387, and he says: "This opinion seems to be more common among recent authors."

depends that the successor of Blessed Peter by name is the Bishop of Rome; and this exists by reason of a human law, which however better and more truly is called ecclesiastic-Apostolic law.”³⁶

443. 3) *But the Vatican Council* wanted absolutely to avoid having to decide this question; therefore it declared expressly: “It is to be noted that a distinction must be made between the *law*, whereby Peter has *in general successors*, which is *from a divine institution*, and between the *law*, whereby Peter has *successors by name in the Roman See*, and which *from the fact of Peter* is repeated: wherefore *the former is said to be by divine law*, but the latter is preferably *by divine ordination*.” Therefore also when the Archbishop of Granada asked that the connection of the Primacy with the Roman See be defined as a matter of divine law, the response given to him was: “The Reverend Father has spoken learnedly and piously, but in the Dogmatic Constitution not every *pious opinion* can be included.”³⁷

444. Therefore from the decrees of the Vatican Council nothing *formally* can be concluded in favor of any one of the three opinions, which are disputed among Catholics. Not from the words: “Peter...even to this time and forever lives and governs and exercises judgment in his successors, the bishops of the holy Roman See” (D 3056); because, as has been declared, the Roman See is clearly said to be founded by Peter himself, not by Christ nor from the will of Christ. And it is also not possible to argue from these words: “Therefore, whoever succeeds Peter in this chair...” (D 3056); because it was expressly pointed out: “It is said, whoever succeeds: in whatever way he succeeds, *whether by divine law* in the first opinion, or *by ecclesiastical law* in the second opinion, or *by a mixed law* in the third opinion.”³⁸

445. 4) In this difficult question, it seems to us that two extremes must be avoided. 1) Privileges of divine law are not to be attributed easily, by which perhaps the power would be limited which belongs to the *Supreme Pontiff* by divine law as the formal successor of St. Peter in the Primacy. 2) The power of separating the Primacy from the Roman See is not to be conceded unadvisedly to the Supreme Pontiff, since the ancient, constant and unanimous tradition of the Church seems to profess its inseparability.

Accordingly, advisably and prudently Benedict XIV said: “Although in a certain sense it could be said that the supreme monarchy of the Church was annexed to the Roman See only by a human law, because actually the union took its origin from the fact of Peter; nevertheless, the opinion of those does not seem to be able to be sustained, who say, that the said annexation is a matter of human law to such an extent that it could be dissolved by the Church and one could be separated from the other.” And Leo XIII did not hesitate to add this reason: “Jesus Christ chose and sanctified for himself the one Roman Church. He commanded that the Chair of his Vicar is to remain here for the

36. Msi 52,31. Benedict XIV seems to hold the same opinion, *De Synodo diocesana* l.2 c.1 n.1.

37. Msi 53,10.720. See Th. Granderath, *Constit. dogmat. Conc. Vaticani* p.137-149.

38. Msi 52,10.1307.

perpetuity of time."³⁹

446. Therefore, some claim that the joining together of the Primacy with the Roman See must be attributed *at least to a divine command*; they say that it was done by St. Peter either "by the miraculous dispensation of Christ" (Gelasius I), or "by a divine revelation" (Innocent III), or "by a divine command" (Hadrian I), or "by the special will of God" (Leo XIII).⁴⁰

447. 6) The perpetual joining together of the Primacy with the Roman Pontificate requires that the one who obtains the Primacy legally is the real Bishop of the Roman Church; but this does not imply an obligation of residence in the City, nor is it an argument for the impossibility that materially Rome could be completely destroyed.⁴¹

448. Objections.⁴² 1. The successor of St. Peter in the Primacy is like the foundation without which the Church cannot exist. But without a Roman Pontiff, when the See is vacant, the Church exists. Therefore the Roman Pontiff is not the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy.

I distinguish the major. The successor of St. Peter in the Primacy is like the primary foundation, principal and by his own right, without which the Church cannot exist, *denied*; he is like a secondary foundation, ministerial and with a vicarious right, *I subdistinguish*: without which and without his exigency together with the actual power arranged by him for the time of the vacant See, the Church cannot exist, *conceded*; without which, but with his exigency together with the actual power arranged for the time of the vacant See, the Church cannot exist, *denied*.⁴³

449. 2. The Roman Pontiff is not constituted, as St. Peter was constituted, *directly and immediately* by Christ in the Primacy. Therefore the Roman Pontiff is not St. Peter's formal successor in the Primacy *by the same divine law*.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Roman Pontiff is not constituted in the Primacy

39. Benedict XIV, *De Synodo diocesana* l.2 c.1 n.1: *Opera Omnia* (Prati 1844) t.11 p.19; Leo XIII: ASS 31 (1899) 645.

40. Gelasius I: Msi 8,76; Innocent III: ML 214,761; Hadrian I: Msi 12,1057; Leo XIII: ASS 20 (1887) 15. See Msi 52,31.

41. The method to be observed in the election of a new Supreme Pontiff was established anew by Pius XII in the *Constit. Apost. "Vacantis Apostolicae Sedis"*: AAS 38 (1946) 65. It seems that the right of designating his successor cannot be denied to the Roman Pontiff: A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.596. See L. Lercher, *De Ecclesia* (1945) n.370-373, where other questions are handled, namely, concerning the reason whereby the Supreme Pontiff can decide about his office and about its distinction from the Apostolic See. To the question: Whether or not the Roman Pontiff, as a private person, can fall into manifest heresy, *Vatican Council I* gave this answer: "Relying on supernatural providence, we think that it is sufficiently probable that this will never happen. For God is not lacking in things that are necessary; and therefore, if he were to permit such an evil, the means to provide for it would not be lacking" (Msi 52,1109). See J. Balmes, *El protestantismo comparado con el catolicismo* c.56; E. Dublanchy: DTC 7,1714-1717.

42. The arguments of the schismatics against the Roman Primacy can be seen in the *Encyclical* signed by 33 Oriental Bishops in 1848 (Msi 40,377-418). See Also M. Jugie, *Theologia Orientalium* 4,408-423. For the main objections, see T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* (1950) 376-384.

43. A.M. Iannotta, *De Ecclesia et Primatu vacante Sede Apostolica* (1919).

directly and immediately by Christ with the same *condition* of a personal designation, *conceded*; he is not constituted in the Primacy directly and immediately by Christ with the same *law* of the institution and succession, *denied*. *I distinguish the consequent in the same way.*

450. 3. Only Christ can be the Head of the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church. Therefore the Roman Pontiff cannot be the head or Leader of the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Only Christ can be the Head of the Church inasmuch as *principally and by his own power* he pours out the internal life of grace, *conceded*; there cannot be with Christ and under Christ another Head of the earthly Church, who ministerially and with the vicarious power of Christ rules the Church, *denied*. *I distinguish the consequent in the same way.*⁴⁴

451. 4. In the Kingdom of holiness, which is the Church, only the Head can be a Saint. Therefore the Roman Pontiff, who is a sinner, is not the Head of the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the Kingdom of holiness made up only of saints, which is the Church triumphant, the Head alone can be a Saint, *conceded*; in the Kingdom of holiness to which sinners needing sanctification also belong, which is the Church militant, *I subdistinguish*: the Head must be a Saint, *conceded*; there cannot be a Head unless his is a saint, or only the Head can be a Saint, *denied*. *I distinguish the consequent the same way.* The Roman Pontiff is not the Head of the Church triumphant, *conceded*; of the Church militant, *denied*.

452. 5. The testimonies in favor of the Primacy in the first three centuries are quite rare and not fully clear. Therefore they do not provide a convincing proof.

I distinguish the antecedent. The testimonies of the first three centuries are not as frequent and explicit as those written after the 3rd century, *conceded*; they do not offer sufficient proof, *I subdistinguish*: if they are taken singly and if the perpetuity of the Primacy is not presupposed as proved, *I bypass that point*; otherwise, *denied*. The testimonies of the first three centuries must be acknowledged to be rather rare, because very many writings of Christians of those times were destroyed and have perished, as the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius of Caesarea proves abundantly.⁴⁵ Furthermore, at that time it was not necessary to deal directly with this matter and to protect this prerogative, because other Churches were not yet trying to usurp it for themselves.

453. 6. Since the middle of the 9th century and especially after the middle of the 16th century, a large part of Christians have denied the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, namely, *the Oriental Schismatics and Protestants*. Therefore the recognition of the Primacy is doubtful.

I distinguish the antecedent. And this testimony of deniers has some dogmatic value, as the testimony of those separated from the unity of the Church, *denied*; historically

44. S.Th. III, q. 8, a. 6.

45. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchliche Literatur* v.1.

is has some value, *I subdistinguish*: if it were supported by the testimony of the first eight centuries, *I bypass that*; if it is, as really happens to be the case, contrary to the ancient and unanimous testimony of those who affirm it during the first eight centuries, *denied*.⁴⁶

454. 7. At the Council of Nicaea I, cn. 6: "Let the ancient custom be preserved throughout Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, so that the Bishop of Alexandria may have power over all of these; because the custom is like that of the Bishop of the City of Rome" (Kch 406). Therefore the singular power of the Roman Bishop is by custom granted to this Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the cited canon the point at issue has to do with honors and privileges of the Patriarchal Sees as such, *conceded*; it has to do with the power of the Primacy, *denied*.⁴⁷

455. 8. At the Council of Constantinople I, cn.3: "Truly the Bishop of Constantinople has the Primacy of honor after the Roman Bishop, because the City itself is younger than Rome" (Kch 648). Therefore the Primacy of the Roman Bishop is acknowledged not by reason of his succession of St. Peter, but by reason of the eminence of the City of Rome.

I distinguish the antecedent. The cited canon is dealing with the Primacy of jurisdiction, *denied*; with the precedence of honor, *I subdistinguish*: concerning the precedence of honor which the Bishop of Constantinople wanted to claim for himself before the Bishop of Alexandria, *conceded*; before the Bishop of Rome, *denied*. Moreover, this canon 3 did not obtain definitive approbation.⁴⁸

456. 9. At the Council of Chalcedon, cn.28: "The canon (3 of the Council of Constantinople I), which was just read, is acknowledged by the 150 Bishops who are dear to God, and we decree and establish the same concerning the privileges of the holy Church of Constantinople, the New Rome. For rightly the Fathers attributed privileges to the throne of ancient Rome, because the City required them. And moved by the same consideration, the 150 Bishops dear to God have attributed equal privileges to the holy throne of the New Rome; for, they have rightly judged that the City, which has been honored with both the Empire and the senate, also enjoys equal privileges with the ancient regal Rome, and also is extolled and magnified in ecclesiastical matters, just as Rome is, since she exists second only to Rome" (Kch 943). Therefore rightly the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople are declared to be equal; their superior rights are said to originate not from the institution of Christ, but from a mere concession of the Fathers; the reason for the preeminence of the Roman Bishop is deduced not from the succes-

46. P.H. Scott, *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy* (1928). Recently this Anglican author demonstrated that the Church of the first eight centuries unanimously acknowledged the Roman Primacy. Likewise the Anglican T.G. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (1944).

47. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Ecclesia in Imperio Romano-Byzantino* (1933) 64.

48. For the explanation of the difficulties from the Councils of Nicaea I, Constantinople I and Chalcedon see T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia*, loc.cit. in note 42.

sion of St. Peter, but from the eminence of the City of Rome. Hence it is clearly denied that the Roman Bishop has the Primacy, by divine law, from the succession of St. Peter.

457. Response. 1) From the text itself of canon 28 it is clear that: a) it is not dealing with the power of jurisdiction, but *with honor and privileges*; b) honor is not being vindicated above Rome, but *after Rome*, over Alexandria and Antioch; c) it is not speaking about the power instituted by divine law, but *about privileges of ecclesiastical law* conceded to the Patriarchal Sees (see Kch 943,3-4).

Response. 2) From the history itself of canon 28 it is certain that: a) this canon was not confectioned by the Council while the Legates of the Pope were presiding, but by the Bishops dependent on Constantinople, in the absence of the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch and the Papal Legates; b) in the last session of the Council the Papal Legates openly contradicted the addition of this canon (Msi 7,453); c) the Constantinople Bishops earnestly asked the Pope that the Canon, the one rejected by the Legates, be confirmed (ML 54,956-984); d) Pope Leo the Great firmly rejected the petition of the Constantinople Bishops, and in such a way that he defended not their rights, but the rights of the Churches of Alexandria and Antioch (Kch 898-901).⁴⁹

Hence from the tenor and history of canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon not only is nothing asserted against the Roman Primacy, but also it can be convincingly proved that the same Primacy was at that time openly acknowledged by the Oriental Church.

458. 10. But Cullmann objects: The Primacy is a priority in the Apostolate itself, whereby Peter was the first of the Apostles to see Jesus after the resurrection, the first after the resurrection to be confirmed by Jesus in the Apostolate, the first Apostle to preach the resurrection of Christ. But such priority cannot be transmitted by succession. Therefore Peter cannot have successors in the Primacy

I distinguish the major. The Primacy is only a chronological priority in the function of the Apostolate of Peter, *denied*; it is an office beyond the Apostolate itself by which Peter was constituted the supreme Pastor of the whole Church, *I subdistinguish*: and this office is *ordinary*, committed surely to Peter as the first subject of the office, but established perennially as an essential constitutive element of the perennial Church, *conceded*; and this office is *extraordinary* and given to the person of Simon Peter and only for the extraordinary circumstances of the first planting of the Church, *denied*.

I also distinguish the minor. The purely chronological priority in the exercise of the Apostolate of Peter and in his designation as the first subject in the office of the Primacy cannot be transmitted by succession, *conceded*; the ordinary office of Primacy established perennially as a constitutive essential element of the perennial Church cannot be transmitted by succession, *denied*.

Cullmann does not seem to grasp the true concept of the Primacy, thinking that the Primacy is nothing but a mere prerogative of honor or direction conceded personally to

49. St. Leo I, *Epistolae* on this matter: ML 54,901-1009. M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.286-293, clearly explains the argument in favor of the Roman Primacy that comes from the Council of Chalcedon. He deals with canon 28 in n.292. See this response in Pius XII, "*Sempiternus Rex*": AAS 43 (1951) 632. See above n.416, note 17. A. Grillmeier-H. Bacht, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (1951-1953).

Peter, in virtue of which Peter was only *the first among equals* of the Apostles by reason of a certain chronological priority in the exercise of the Apostolate.⁵⁰

11. But Cullmann insists: To be a fundamental rock to permanently support and preserve a building in its unity is obtained by the fact that some rock is chosen by the architect and placed in the foundation of a building. Therefore, to be the fundamental rock to permanently support and preserve the Church in its unity was obtained by Christ because he chose the person of Peter and placed him in the foundation of the Church. But if the person of Peter is chosen and placed in the foundation of a perennial Church—that cannot be transmitted by succession. Therefore being the fundamental rock to permanently support and preserve the Church in its unity cannot be transmitted by succession.⁵¹

I distinguish the antecedent. In material buildings, in which a rock is chosen and placed by the architect, by its very nature it already possesses perpetuity and the power to materially support the building and to preserve it in its unity, *conceded*; in social structures in which a person is chosen and placed as a rock it lacks for itself perpetuity and needs to be endowed with power in order socially to support the structure and to preserve it in its unity, *denied*.

Similarly, *I distinguish the consequent.* If the person of Simon had for himself the perpetuity and power which are required in order to support the Church permanently and preserve it in its social unity, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*.

I distinguish the minor. If the reason for the choice and placing in the foundation of the Church were merely personal and transitory, *conceded*; if such a reason is the power which must always necessarily exist in the Church and which perennially is to be possessed and exercised by some person, *denied*.

Similarly, *I distinguish the second consequent.* Regarding the things that are transitory and proper to the person chosen as the subject, *conceded*; regarding the things that are perennial and proper to the office constituted in view of the Church and established to last forever, *denied*.

It should be noted well that the person of Simon is the fundamental rock of the visible Church, not by reason of the person himself, but by reason of the powers with which the person of Peter has been invested by Christ. However, these powers were indeed given to the person of Simon, but not *in consideration of the person* but *in consideration of the Church* and in order that the Church may subsist, as is clear from Matt. 16:17ff. Therefore, it is necessary that they exist perennially in the perennial Church. But social powers cannot exist unless they are exercised in person by some individuals. Therefore Peter will always have successors in the Primacy, even though in the words of Matt. 16:17ff. explicit allusion to them perhaps is not made. See what we said in n.382.

50. O. Cullmann, *Saint Pierre, Disciple-Apôtre-Martyr* (1952) 195-200.

51. O. Cullmann, *loc.cit.*, 183-191. See Karrer, Journet, Cerfaux, Vodopivec, and other authors cited in n.382, note 28.

ARTICLE IV

ON THE POWER AND NATURE OF THE PRIMACY

Thesis 10. The primatial power of the Supreme Pontiff is universal, ordinary, immediate, truly episcopal, supreme and full, and on earth there is no judgment higher than his.

459. S.Th., *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem* c.4 (in the Roman edition of his *Opuscula* 19); D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif.* Th.12-17; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.711-755; I. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.404-417; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* 301-314; Id., *Instit. Theol. Fundam. De Ecclesia* th.35-42; R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* c.6 a.48; M. D'Herbigny, n.375; De Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.279; L. Lercher (1945) th.47; Th. Granderath, *Constitut. Dogmat. Conc. Vaticani* 150-165, 220-230; P. Ballerini, *De vi et ratione Primatus*: Mig., *Theol. Curs.* III 899-1108.

460. Connection. Up to this point we have followed the way of proceeding of Vatican Council I (D 3050-3058); therefore we have explained the doctrine: 1) on the institution of the Primacy, 2) on its perpetuity in the Roman Bishop. Therefore it remains for us to explain 3) the nature of the Primacy itself according to the same Vatican Council (D 3059-3064).

461. Definition of terms. In this doctrine of the Vatican Council we are using the terms which were used in the same Council, as Granderath explained them in the cited places.¹

Primatial power is the supreme power of jurisdiction, which we treated in the theses on the institution and perpetuity of the Primacy.

462. Universal is understood both by reason of the persons and by reason of the objects. *By reason of the persons* that power is universal which is extended to all faithful Christians and pastors of the Church, whether taken individually or collectively. *By reason of the objects* that power is universal which covers all matters in the Church.

463. It is called *ordinary* inasmuch as it is opposed to both extraordinary and delegated power. Ordinary power, *according as it is opposed to the extraordinary*, is the power which, not only by exception in certain cases or circumstances, but continually in all cases and circumstances can always be exercised. *According as it is opposed to delegated power*, ordinary power is that which either by institution or by law is annexed to an office established to last perpetually, and therefore it belongs to some person by reason of the office; while on the contrary *delegated* power is that which has been

1. Th. Granderath, *Constitut. Dogmat. Conc. Vaticani* p.220-230.

communicated to a person and is exercised by the right or in the name of someone else.

464. It can be *immediate* in two ways: namely, in force or in grade. With immediate *force* is the power that can be exercised, without the use of a necessary medium, over all persons or causes to which it is extended. Immediate in its *grade* is said to be that power which holds the lowest grade of subordinated powers.

465. *Episcopal* is power that is truly pastoral, fulfilled in the office of teaching, sanctifying and governing, and indeed with ordinary and immediate effectiveness. It is opposed to the power proper to a Metropolitan, which is a rather restricted right of inspection joined together with some extraordinary jurisdiction in certain cases. Therefore, the Roman Pontiff, because his power is truly Episcopal, can accomplish in every diocese and regarding all the Christian faithful everything that each Bishop is able to do in his own diocese as their own pastor.

466. Power can be said to be supreme in two ways: namely, positively and exclusively. Supreme *positively* in the Church is the power which is not subject to any power of the Church. Supreme *exclusively* is the power which excludes not only some superior power, but also any equal power. In Vatican Council I the supreme power of the Roman Pontiff was declared to be *not exclusive, but positive*; and therefore an *Ecumenical Council*, under the Roman Pontiff as its head, can be acknowledged to have supreme power, not superior to, but *equal* to the power of the Pope, from which by reason of the subject *it differs only inadequately*. See CIC 228 [1917].

467. Power is said to be *full* in two ways: namely, extensively and intensively. Full *extensively* is the power which can be used in all ecclesiastical causes, not only in matters of faith and morals, but also in all other things, which pertain to the discipline and governance of the Church. Full *intensively* is the power which covers not only the most important parts, but also all part of jurisdiction. But this fullness is said to be *not exclusive, but positive*, as was explained above.

468. The supreme judgment is that to which recourse can be made in every affair of the Church and by all the faithful, and it cannot be revised or made subject to any other authority on earth.

469. State of the question. We are saying that the Power of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff is: universal, both by reason of the person and by reason of its objects; ordinary, in the sense that it is opposed to both extraordinary and delegated power; immediate, not however in grade, but certainly in effectiveness; episcopal, that is, pastoral that is complete in its own nature and also ordinary and immediate; supreme, not exclusively but positively; full, both extensively and intensively. It has the right of universal judgment, supreme, irreversible and it is not subject to the judgment of anyone else.

470. Adversaries. 1) *Oriental Schismatics* since Photius in the middle of the 9th century, and especially since Michael Cerularius in the middle of the 11th century, whose errors were rejected by Nicholas I in 865, and Leo IX in 1053 (D 638, 641-642, 352-353 [34th ed.]).

2) Several *Canonists* between the 10th and 15th centuries who held that, at least in certain causes or circumstances, the authority of a universal Council is over the Pope, especially when it comes to judging the Pope regarding heresy or schism.

471. After the Avignon period of the Popes (1309-1377), especially because of the Western Schism (1378-1417), the professors at the University of Paris developed the teaching about the authority of a general Council over the Pope; the principal proponents of this were Conrad von Gelnhausen, Henry von Langenstein, John Gerson, Peter D'Ailly, and others.²

4) *The doctrine on the Council above the Pope* prevailed among Theologians and Canonists of the Councils of *Pisa* (1409) and *Constance*, which in session V in the year 1415, especially by the urging of Gerson and Cardinal Peter D'Ailly, declared that the Pope must obey a Council. The same teaching was renewed later, in the year 1434, by the Council of Basel. However, these declarations did not obtain the confirmation of the Supreme Pontiff (D 1247 note 1, 1445).³

472. 5) From the above actions *Gallicanism* took its origin; its primitive

2. C. von Gelnhausen (+ 1390), *Epistola concordiae*; H. von Langenstein (+ 1397), *Epistolae pacis*; J. Gerson, *Quomodo et an liceat a Summo Pontifice appellare seu eius declinare iudicium* (1418); ed. Dupin, 2,303; P. D'Ailly (+ 1420), *Tractatus de Ecclesiae, Concilii generalis, Romani Pontificis et Cardinalium potestate* 2,4; *Opera Gersonis*, ed. Dupin, 2,958. See V. Martin, *Comment s'est formée la doctrine de la supériorité du Concile sur le Pape*: *RevScRel* 17 (1937) 121-143, 261-289, 405-427; M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (1933) 112-117; H.X. Arquillière, *L'appel au Concile sous Philippe le Bel et la genèse des théories conciliaires*: *RevQHist* 89 (1911) 23-55; A.G. Martimort, *Le Gallicanisme de Bossuet* (1953) 36-41. See J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el misterio de la Iglesia*: *RevEspT* 14 (1954) 215f.

3. Msi 27,590; 29,91.409. See I. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.300; Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 347f.

form is present in the *Pregmatica* of Charles VII in 1438; Pithou developed it further and it was vigorously advocated by Edmund Richerius (D 2602, 2603 with the note).⁴ A milder form of Gallicanism is present in the four articles of the "Declaration of the Clergy" in the year 1682 (D 2282-2283). Under this milder form of Gallicanism several authors advocated the error, like Launoy, Bossuet, Tournely, Van Espen, and others.⁵

6) Also from this source came the errors of the Jansenists (D 2329), and also the errors of Febronius, Eybel, Tamburini, the *Synod of Pistoia*, etc. (D 2592-2597, 2603 with the note). *Vatican Council I* intended to reject these authors expressly.⁶

473. Doctrine of the Church. The teaching of our thesis has been defined by the ecclesiastical Magisterium: 1) in the year 1274, when the opinion of the Canonists prevailed, by the *Council of Lyons II* (D 861); 2) in 1351, before the Western Schism, by the Avignon Pope, Clement VI (D 1052-1057); 3) in 1439, after the Councils of Constance and Basel and then, after the appearance of Gallicanism, by the *Council of Florence* (D 1307); 4) finally, in 1870, against Gallicanism of every kind and against the authors in the 18th and 19th centuries favoring Gallicanism or Jansenism, by *Vatican Council I* (D 3060, 3063, 3064).

474. At Vatican Council I some of the Fathers, having been influenced by the milder form of Gallicanism, held that the last words of the definition of the Council of Florence (D 1307) should be interpreted so that they signify that power belongs to the Pope according to the manner and measure with which the general Councils have determined it. The same point was advocated by Döllinger during the sessions of Vatican I. In order to support this point of view they referred to the Greek text, as well as the authentic Latin, where it was said: καθ' ὃν τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῶν οἰκουμενικῶν συνόδων διαλαμβάνεται. But the *Vatican Council* rejected this interpretation of the Gallicans, and authentically declared the meaning of the words of the Florentine Council.⁷

475. In order to gain a more accurate understanding of the definition of the Vatican Council, it is necessary to note that some of the Fathers favoring Gallicanism tried strenuously, even by recourse both personal and in writing to the Supreme Pontiff, that in the definition at least this sentence should be deleted: "or if anyone says that he has

4. Pithou, *Les libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane* (1594); E. Richer, *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* (1612).

5. See I. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia*, n.279; H. Van Laak, *Instit. Theol. Fundam. De Ecclesia* th.37; Bossuet was the author of four articles: DTC 4,197-201; DHGE 9,1378-82; A.G. Martimort, *loc. cit.*, note 2.

6. Febronius, *De statu Ecclesiae* (1763); Eybel, *Was ist der Papst* (1782); Tamburini, *Vera idea della s. Sede* (1784); D 2603 with the note. See Th. Granderath, *Constit. Dogmat. Conc. Vaticani* 220-230; H. Van Laak, *Instit. Theol. Fundam. De Ecclesia* th.39.

7. H. Van Laak, *loc. cit.*, th.35; Th. Granderath, *loc. cit.*, 150-154; I. Döllinger, *Allgemeine Zeitung* (21-1-1870); see CivCat (1870) ser.7 9,397-400; Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. Des Conc.* 7,1032-1051.

only a more important part and not the complete fullness of the supreme power" (D 3064), lest the milder form of Gallicanism be expressly condemned. However, they were not successful.⁸ But contrary to those who thought that the jurisdiction of Bishops is diminished by such ample power of the Pope, it was defined that by the fullness of the papal authority nothing is removed from the ordinary and immediate proper authority of Bishops (D 3061).

476. Finally, it was declared that the opinions freely debated among theologians was not touched by the Council: 1) concerning the subject of supreme and full authority in the Church, whether the Roman Pontiff is the only subject, or the moral body of Bishops under the Roman Pontiff is *also another* subject of supreme power, *distinguished only inadequately from the Roman Pontiff*; 2) concerning the way in which jurisdiction is conferred on Bishops, whether through *the mediation of the Supreme Pontiff*, or *immediately by God*, although fully subordinate to the Roman Pontiff.⁹

After the Vatican definition Leo XIII vindicated and explained the same doctrine in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" (ASS 28,734-737), and Pius XII, "*Ad Sinarum gentem*" (AAS 47 [1955] 9).

477. Theological note. Therefore the doctrine of the thesis is *a matter of defined faith*, especially in the *Councils of Lyons II, Florence and Vatican I* (D 861, 1307, 3059-3064).

478. Proof. 1) *With a general argument.* The Supreme Pontiff is truly and fully *the Vicar of Christ*, or "he has the same power perpetually in the Church which He Himself had in his mortal life." But the power of Christ was universal, ordinary, immediate, truly episcopal, supreme and full, and on earth there was no other power superior to his judgment. Therefore the primatial power of the Supreme Pontiff is universal, ordinary, immediate, truly episcopal, supreme and full, and on earth no other power is superior to his judgment.

The major is certain from thesis 6, in which we proved that Christ established his own Vicar on earth; this thesis is taught expressly by Clement VI and Leo XIII (D 1054-1056; ASS 28,736;). Finally also by Pius XII (AAS 35,204-210f.216.227).

The minor is clear from the notion itself of power, which is asserted,

8. See Th. Granderath, *loc.cit.*, 160-164. On the same day of July 16 Pius IX answered them through the Sub-Secretary of the Council; he said that he would leave the whole matter to the General Congregation, while reserving to himself the definitive decision (*loc.cit.*, 164).

9. See Th. Granderath, *loc.cit.*, 164f.223f.229f.

according to the individual attributes ascribed to it, if it is compared with the actual power of Christ.

479. 2) *One by one* the attributes of the power of the Supreme Pontiff, which are asserted in the thesis, are deduced from an analysis of the power conferred on him by Christ.

A. *The power of the Supreme Pontiff is universal:* a) *by reason of the persons taken singly*, because it extends to all the sheep of Christ's flock, which includes individually both the faithful and the pastors (John 21:15; John 10:9-11); b) *by reason of the persons taken collectively*, because it extends to all parts of the Church, just as the efficacy of a foundation extends to all parts of the building, even taken collectively (Matt. 16:18); c) *by reason of the objects*, because his authority of binding and loosing extends to all affairs of the Church (Matt. 16:19).

480. B. *The power of the Supreme Pontiff is ordinary:* a) *as it is opposed to extraordinary power*, because it can be exercised continually and always in all cases and circumstances (Matt. 16:19); b) *as it is opposed to delegated power*, because from the institution of Christ it is annexed to the office established in perpetuity, and so it belongs to the Roman Pontiff *by reason of his office* of founding the Church and feeding the flock of the faithful of Christ (Matt. 16:18; John 21:15-17).

481. C. *The power of the Supreme Pontiff is immediate in its effectiveness*, because it can be exercised towards all persons and causes in the Church directly without the necessity of relying on anyone else (Matt. 16:19; John 21:16-17).

482. D. *The power of the Supreme Pontiff is truly episcopal*, because it is truly pastoral, made complete by the office of teaching, sanctifying and governing, and also ordinary and immediate in its effectiveness (Matt. 16:19; John 21:15-17; see John 10:9-11). That the power of the Supreme Pontiff is *episcopal* if inferred also from the fact that it is universal by reason of the objects and also that it is ordinary and immediate, as is certain from A,B,C.

483. E. *The power of the Supreme Pontiff is positively supreme*, or is subject to no other power in the Church, because it is *like the natural foundation* of all other power in the Church (Matt. 16:18); because it is universal by reason of the persons taken both singly and collectively

(above A, a-b); because by it the Roman Pontiff is constituted as the *only supreme Vicar of Christ* (Matt. 16:18f.; John 21:15-17). For these reasons it is also concluded that there cannot be another subject of supreme power in the Church, of which the Roman Pontiff is not its *foundation and head*.

484. F. *The power of the Supreme Pontiff is full:* a) *extensively*, because it is universal both by reason of the objects and by reason of the persons; b) *intensively*, because as proper simply to the Key-Carrier of the Kingdom of heaven, by no reason can it be restricted to the more powerful parts, but it necessarily includes all parts by its power (Matt. 16:19). It is clear that the power of the Roman Pontiff is *full*, because it cannot be perfected by any other source: not *by reason of the subjects*, because it is universal related to all persons; not *by reason of the objects*, because it is universal related to all causes; not *by reasons of the means to be used*, because it is immediate; not *by reason of its efficacy* or force, because it is supreme; not *by reason of the manner* of possessing it, because it is ordinary and proper, and only it takes the place of Christ himself.

485. G. *There is no other judgment on earth superior to that of the Roman Pontiff*, because, since his power is universal, in every cause in the Church and by any of the faithful there can be recourse to the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, and because, as *held ratified by God*, the judgment of the Roman Pontiff, by which by binding and loosing all causes are decided, cannot be restricted or overruled by the judgment of any other authority on earth (Matt. 16:19).

486. Objections.¹⁰ 1. St. Cyprian: "The episcopate is one, the part of which is held together by the individual bishops" (R 556). Therefore the total fullness of power does not belong to the Roman Pontiff, but only its better part.

I distinguish the antecedent. The episcopate is one, inasmuch as the College of Bishops has unity; the reason for this unity is the supreme power of the successor of St. Peter, *conceded*; the episcopate is one, inasmuch as the individual Bishops are equal in power, so that the successor of St. Peter does not obtain supreme and full power over all the others, *denied*. We are abstracting from the question, whether or not St. Cyprian himself understood the complete power and nature of the Primacy.¹¹

487. 2. St. Gregory I. refused the title of universal or ecumenical Bishop. Therefore the power of the Roman Pontiff cannot be said to be universal.

10. See H. Van Laak, *Instit. De Ecclesia* th.35-42; Difficulties; I. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.282; I. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.412-417; T. Zalelena, *De Ecclesia* (1950) 390; C. Caruel, *De Ecclesia* (manuscript) (1892) 588-609.

11. See T. Zalelena, *loc.cit.*, 343; I. De Guibert, *loc.cit.*, n.282.

I distinguish to antecedent. St. Gregory the Great refused this title, understood in an exclusive sense by which John of Constantinople attributed it to himself, *conceded*; he denied that this title belongs to the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy, *denied*.¹²

488. 3. It is unbefitting that two should be constituted with ordinary and immediate episcopal power over the same community of the faithful. Therefore episcopal power must be denied to the Roman Pontiff that is ordinary and immediate over the particular Churches, which are governed by their own Bishop.

I distinguish the antecedent. It would be unbefitting if two mutually independent Bishops were constituted over the same community, *conceded*; it would be unbefitting if two, of whom one is subordinate to the other, were constituted over the same community, *denied*. "According to this over the same people immediately are both the parish priest and the Bishop and the Pope."¹³

489. 4. *The Council of Constantinople III*, in the year 681, judged and condemned Pope Honorius. Therefore in practice it acknowledged that the Pope is under a Council.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Council of Constantinople III judged and condemned the Pope actually holding the supreme authority, *denied*; after his death, which occurred in the year 638, *I subdistinguish*: it condemned the Pope as exercising the supreme authority or as defining something *ex cathedra*, *denied*; while responding to Sergius with lesser ordinary authority, *I subdistinguish again*: a Council not approved by the Pope condemned Honorius, *I bypass that*; a Council approved by the Pope condemned Honorius, *I subdistinguish again*: it condemned Honorius for an error in doctrine, *denied*; for his negligence in curbing heresy, *conceded* (see D 485-497; 496-498; Kch 1082-1089).

490. 5. *The Council of Constance* (1414-1418), in sessions IV and V, declared that it has power immediately from God, which also the Pope is bound to obey. Therefore the Council of Constance defined that the Pope is subject to a general Council.

I distinguish the antecedent. It declared this with a decree confirmed by the Roman Pontiff, *denied*; with a decree not confirmed by the Pope, *I subdistinguish*: it declared that a doubtful Pope, which was the case in point, is bound to accept the solution of the Council, *conceded*; it declared that a certainly legitimate Pope must be subject to a general Council, *denied* (D 1247 and the note).¹⁴

12. According to the testimony of St. Gregory, *Epistolarum* 1.5 epist.18: "John, after despising his brothers, wanted to be called the only Bishop." Therefore St. Gregory did not want to use the title "universal" "lest if he took for himself the glory of singularity in the Pontificate, he might seem to have denied it to all his brothers" (ML 77,738.740; D 3061). See C. Mazzella, *De Rel. et Ecclesia* n.975; S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* p.124f.

13. S.Th., *Suppl.* q.8, a. 5 ad 3; 4 d.17 a.4 q.4 ad 3. See Leo XIII, Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*": ASS 28,737.

14. You will find a more ample explanation of these objections and the solution of other difficulties in the authors we cited above in note 10. See also below, n.651-657.

CONCLUSION

THE ROMAN-CATHOLIC CHURCH ALONE IS THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST

Thesis 11. From the demonstrated divine institution and perpetuity of the Church, of the Hierarchy and of the Primacy it is inferred: that the Roman-Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Christ.

491. Suarez, *Defensio fidei* l.1 c.7 n.10; R. Cercia, *De Ecclesia vera Christi* v.1 s.3 lec.8 and 14; s.4 lec.4; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.1439-1441; L. Billot, th.9; M. D'Herbigny, n.177,2; 222,1; 265.281.313.1; I. De Guibert, n.145; L. Lercher, th.31° n.315; T. Zapelena (1950) 384.

492. Connection. We have proved: 1) that Christ instituted his own hierarchical and monarchical Church; 2) that the Church instituted by Christ with its own Hierarchy and Primacy is to continue to exist perpetually; 3) that the Roman Pontiff is the successor in the Primacy of St. Peter. Now we are asking whether or not from those facts it can be deduced which one of the many confessions, which call themselves the true Church of Christ, really is the legitimate Church of Christ.

493. Definition of terms. That Church is *Roman-Catholic*, which, diffused throughout the world, acknowledges that the Roman Pontiff is endowed with the supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church of Christ.

We are saying that *the true Church of Christ* is the one that Christ really wanted, in opposition to all the others which, although they call themselves Christian, nevertheless falsely attributed this name to themselves.

494. Adversaries. 1) In general, all those are adversaries who in some way deny that the Roman-Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ.

2) All those *Protestants* who do not acknowledge in the Church of Christ the perpetuity of the Hierarchy.

3) *Anglicans* and *Schismatic Orientals*, who although they admit the Hierarchy of the Church, nevertheless deny the supreme Primacy of jurisdiction.

4) The proponents of the *three branch theory*, or of the *tripartite Church* (D 2285).

5) Contemporary defenders of *Pan-Christianity* (D 2199 [34th ed.]).¹

1. Pius XI in his Encyclical "*Mortalium animos*"; AAS 20 (1928) 5-16, condemns the false endeavors of Pan-Christianity. See their opinions in *Etudes Oecuméniques: Documents de l'Assemblée d'Amsterdam*, 5 vol. (1949).

495. Doctrine of the Church. The assertion of the thesis is taught at least implicitly by Pelagius I (D 446), Pelagius II (D 468-469), Pius IX (D 2886-2888).

496. Theological note. Therefore the doctrine of the thesis is a conclusion deduced from the preceding theses as *theologically certain*; but from the Magisterium of the Church it is at least *Catholic doctrine*.

497. The Church of Christ is perennial. Therefore it also exists now, and necessarily is one of those that call themselves Christian, that is, either Protestant, or Anglican, or Schismatic Oriental, or Catholic, or a confederation of all these confessions. But the Church of Christ cannot be Protestant, nor Anglican, nor Schismatic Oriental, nor a confederation of all Christian confessions. For, in the Church of Christ that is to last perpetually the Primacy can never be lacking. But neither the Protestant, nor the Anglican, nor the Schismatic Oriental, nor the confederation of all Christians acknowledge a true Primacy of jurisdiction. Therefore, the only Christian confession, which can be the true Church of Christ, is the Roman-Catholic, since it alone confesses a true Primacy of jurisdiction, to which it says that all of Christ's faithful must be subject.

498. Scholium. A note on Romanness. The conclusion, which precedes, is independent of the further question: whether this proof of the truth of the Church, from the existence and recognition in it of the perpetual Primacy, properly must be said to be from *the note of Romanness*, or not.² But it is certain that a true Primacy of jurisdiction is a characteristic and necessary property of the Church of Christ; hence it can be concluded immediately that a Church that does not have the Primacy is not the true Church of Christ.³

499. In this sense not undeservedly some authors speak about the Primacy as a characteristic and sufficient note to distinguish the true Church of Christ from the false ones; and they say that it is "communion with the successor of Peter" (Straub). But by others this distinctive property is called either "the note of Peterness" (D'Herbigny), or "the note of Romanness" (De Guibert).⁴

500. Hence in the true Church of Christ the *Rock* is not only the ontological reason for its unity and stability, but it is also *the logical reason of distinguishing* the true Church from the false ones, according to these beautiful words of St. Ambrose: "It is Peter himself to whom He said: You are Peter and upon *this* rock I will built *my* Church. Therefore

2. R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.18 n.8, the doubts he raises are inefficacious.

3. D. Palmieri, *De Romano Pontifice* (1902) Appendix p.757; Corollary p.771.

4. A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.1439; M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.221,1; 281,1; 313.1; I. De Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.145.

where Peter is, there is the Church" (R 1261). The following are thought to have the same view: St. Irenaeus (R 210), St. Cyprian (Kch 266 with note 5), St. Optatus Milevitanus (R 1242), St. Jerome (R 1346), St. Augustine (R 1580).

BOOK II

ON THE MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH AND ITS SOURCES

CHAPTER I

On the divine institution of the Magisterium

SINGLE ARTICLE

THE MAGISTERIUM WAS INSTITUTED BY CHRIST IN THE APOSTLES

Thesis 12. Christ the Lord instituted in the Apostles the authentic Magisterium; it is infallible and destined to continue forever.

501. S.Th. III, q. 12, a. 3; q. 42, a. 1-4; *De ver.* q. 11, a. 1; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 a.2 and 5; *In 3* q.42 d.30; *De Christo Doctore*; St. R. Bellarmine, *De contro.* 1 l.3 and 4; 3 l.4; M. Cano, *De locis* l.4; I.B. Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura* (1896); D. Palmieri, *Proleg. de Ecclesia* § 21-47; J.B. Bainvel, *De Magisterio vivo et Traditione* (1905); Cl. Schrader, *De teologico tertium fonte* (1878); Vacant, *Le magistère ordinaire de l'Eglise et ses organes* (1887); H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* t.2. *De Ecclesiae Magisterio* (1925) I Ph. Alonso Bárcena, *De Ecclesiae Magisterio de divina Traditione* (1945).

In particular for this thesis, see De Groot, q.8 a.3 and q.10 a.1; M. D'Herbigny, th.11; Ottiger, th.1; Dorsch, th.16f.; Muncunill, n.286; Van Laak, *Repetitorium, De Ecclesia* th.18f.; Schultes, a.32; Lercher, th.28; Zapelena, th.16.¹

502. Connection. In the first book we proved that Christ as King instituted his Kingdom on his Apostles, that is, the society of men endowed with the power of ruling, teaching and sanctifying, which he called his Church. Now in the second book we will see that the same Christ as Master established an infallible Magisterium in his Church; this thesis will deal with this institution.

503. Definition of terms. *A Magisterium* in general is an institution to teach others. A twofold form is usually distinguished: a teaching and an attesting Magisterium. *A teaching Magisterium* is one that is ordered to producing knowledge in its hearers, because of the arguments by which the teaching or the proposed facts are demonstrated. *An attesting Magisterium* is one that is ordered to obtain assent because of the authority of the Master,

1. For a historical and biographical introduction to the treatise on the Magisterium, see J.V. Bainvel, *De Magisterio vivo* (1905) n.1-8. See J. Salaverri, *La potestad de Magisterio eclesiástico y asentimiento que le es debido*: EstEcl 29 (1955) 155-195.

or because of his knowledge and truthfulness.

504. *Authentic magisterium* (from αὐθεντία = authority) is the office of handing on doctrine instituted by a legitimate authority. Therefore, it implies in the teacher the power and office of handing on doctrine; but in the disciples the obligation and right to receive instruction. Magisterium can be *authentic* in two ways: in the broad sense and in the strict sense.

Authentic magisterium in the broad sense is that which by itself does not have the power to demand from the disciple the assent of the intellect. Such is, for example, the magisterium of a professor in a university. *Authentic magisterium in the strict sense* is that which has such power in itself to impose doctrine, that the disciples by that very fact are bound to give the assent of the intellect, because of the authority of the legate of God which the teacher makes use of.

505. *Infallible magisterium* is that which obtains the highest level of authority. For, infallibility is, in general, immunity from error, which customarily is distinguished in two ways: a) *Infallibility of fact*, or mere inerrancy, is the simple fact of immunity from error. b) *Infallibility of right* is the impossibility of erring, which can happen in two ways: one is *extrinsic*, whose cause is external to the subject, like the assistance of the Holy Spirit; the other is *intrinsic*, whose cause is internal to the subject; in turn, there can be two forms of this: one is *essential*, whose cause is the essence itself of the thing, like the infallibility of God; but the other is *accidental*, whose cause is the internal, accidental quality of the thing, such as the infallibility of an author inspired by God.²

506. *The assistance of infallibility* is distinguished from revelation and from inspiration: a) *Revelation*, or the attesting speech of God, is the action of God alone intrinsically enlightening the intellect of a man and in virtue of this he passively receives in some way new truth. b) *Inspiration*, or a movement from God to express the truth, is an action of God moving a man intrinsically, in virtue of which a man, as an instrument of God, expresses a truth which God wishes to communicate, either orally (prophetic inspiration) or in writing (biblical inspiration). c) *The assistance of infallibility*, or preservation from error, is the vigilance of God per se directing a man from without, so that a man, as the principal cause, can propose the word of God without error, whether it is revealed or inspired.

Therefore God speaks in Revelation, he manifests himself in Inspiration, with his Assistance he protects the word of God, that is, God by Revelation is a communicator, by his inspiration an Author, by his Assistance a guardian of the word of God. But man

2. Knowledge of this kind can also be said to be per se infused.

under Revelation passively hears, under Inspiration instrumentally expresses, under Assistance principally declares the word of God. This distinction of a threefold charism can be illustrated by an example from Acts 4:12, where a statement is given, which at the same time is both revealed and inspired and infallibly preached.³

507. Finally, *magisterium* is customarily divided into written and living. *Purely written magisterium* is what any author exercises in his writings, even after his death. Such is, for example, the magisterium that even now Aristotle exercises in his works. *Magisterium* is said to be *living* which is exercised by the vital and conscious acts of men, whether the teacher makes use of writings or not. This living magisterium can be further divided into *traditional* and non-traditional or *inventive*. *The non-traditional or inventive magisterium* is said to be a magisterium that objectively can always add new truths or to discover them by philosophizing. But *traditional magisterium* is that which objectively must only guard, declare, explain and defend a closed deposit of truths.⁴

508. State of the question. In the thesis we affirm especially that Christ instituted in the Apostles an *authentic Magisterium*, with authenticity in the strict sense; *it is to continue perennially* for as long as the Church lasts; it is *infallible* with the infallibility of right, derived from an extrinsic cause or from the divine assistance. From the theses on the subject and object of this Magisterium it will be made clear that this Magisterium is to be understood as living and traditional.

509. Adversaries. In antiquity, from the end of the Apostolic age to the middle of the 3rd century, the *Gnostics* placed their teaching before the doctrinal authority of the Apostles; wherefore St. Irenaeus in strong terms said against them: "The true knowledge is the teaching of the Apostles" (R 204, 242). But around the year 140 in particular Marcion, who subjected the Scriptures themselves to his own judgment and criticism, also according to the testimony of St. Irenaeus, "persuaded his disciples that he himself is more true than the Apostles are" (R 195). At the beginning of the 3rd century, when he was already a *Montanist*, Tertullian said: "The Paraclete will be affirmed and honored as the only Teacher from Christ." And according to him, what possesses power is "the Church of the Spirit through the spiritual man, not the Church with its many Bishops" (ML 2,890.1026); therefore he

3. See S. Tromp, *De sacrae Scripturae inspiratione* (1945) 95-97; R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* (1925) 286 note 2 and 534 corollary 1.

4. See Van Laak, *Repetitorium, De Ecclesia* part 2, On Infallibility, assertion 2; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) th.16.

has deservedly been called “the father of the spiritualism of Protestants.”

510. Since the 16th century Protestants have taught things like this. For, by admitting the doctrinal authority of Holy Scripture alone understood by one’s own private interpretation, they completely rejected all authentic and a fortiori infallible Magisterium of the Church (see D 1479, 1501, 1507-1508, 3007). In this Protestants are following the teaching of Wycliffe, who at the end of the 14th century taught: “Truth, which is not in Scripture, is nowhere” (*De civili dominio*, 1,44).

Others are teaching the same thing in our time, like Barth, who on January 5, 1947, while addressing an ecumenical meeting of theologians in Geneva, said: The office and mission of the Church is “to tell the whole world that it is absolutely impossible that there should be something revealed or in the strict sense an authoritative word of God or some other form of the divine will absolutely binding, outside of sacred Scripture alone.”⁵

511. Since the middle of the 19th century the *Rationalists* especially have been opposed to our thesis, holding that no source or criterion of truth that is above reason can be admitted. *Semi-Rationalists* are closely related to the Rationalists; but although they do admit divine revelation, still they refuse to acknowledge the authority of the magisterium of men over and above reason, as one can conclude from the condemnations of Hermes, Günther and Frohschammer (D 2738, 2827, 2850).

Modernists, finally, teach that the only source and criterion of religious truth is one’s own conscience or religious sense (D 2093 [34th ed.]).

512. Doctrine of the Church. *Vatican Council I* at least implicitly defined: a) that the Magisterium was divinely *instituted* in the Apostles (D 3012, 3018); b) that this Magisterium is truly *authentic or authoritative*, whether in interpreting the Scriptures (D 3007), or in proposing to the faithful truths that must be believed with divine and Catholic faith (D 3011), or in passing judgment on scientific or philosophical truths which have a necessary connection with the deposit of faith (D 3017-3018); c) that the Magisterium instituted by Christ is going to continue perennially (D 3050-3052, 3071); d) that the same Magisterium of the Church enjoys the prerogative of *infallibility* (D 3020, 3073-3074); e) and finally that the Magisterium is *traditional*, or instituted not to teach new things, but to guard, defend and declare the received deposit of truths (D 3069-3070).

513. In the same *Vatican Council*, an explicit definition of our doctrine was prepared. In *draft 1*, can. 7: “If any one says that the same Church of Christ can be covered

5. K. Barth, *Die Schrift und die Kirche: Die Auctorität und Bedeutung der Bibel*; see DivThom (Fr) 29 (1951) 322. On the opinions of Protestants, see J. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.208-329.

with darkness, or corrupted with evils, by which it would depart from salutary faith and the truth of morals... let him be anathema"; and can. 9: "If any one says that the infallibility of the Church is restricted to those things only that are contained in divine revelation... let him be anathema." But in the reformulated second draft, can. 9 says: "If any one says that the Church of Christ whether in believing or in teaching can fall away from the true faith, or that she is certainly immune from error in no other things, except in those that per se are contained in the word of God, let him be anathema."⁶

Shortly after *Vatican Council I* Leo XIII vindicated the same doctrine in his Encyclical "*Sapientiae christianae*" (D 1936c [34th ed.]) and in his Encyclical "*Satis cognitum*" (D 3305).

Pius XI preaches that Christ is the Teacher and openly teaches the infallible Magisterium of his Church in the Encyclical "*Divini illius Magistri*" (D 3686).

514. Pius XII beautifully derives the doctrine of Christ the Teacher from Holy Scripture itself, when in the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*" he says: "Christ enlightens the whole of his Church... *Coming as a Teacher from God that He might give testimony to the truth* (John 3:2; 18:37), He so illuminated the primitive apostolic Church with His light that the Prince of the Apostles exclaimed: *Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou has the words of eternal life* (John 6:68). From heaven He so assisted the Evangelists that, as members of Christ, they acted as though at the dictation of the Head. Of our faith, too, He is the author today during our exile on earth, as He will be its finisher in our heavenly home. He it is who sheds upon believers the light of faith; who divinely endows Pastors and Teachers, and especially His Vicar on earth, with the supernatural gifts of knowledge, understanding and wisdom that enable them to guard vigilantly the treasure of the faith, zealously defend it, piously expound it, and fortify it with every care. It is He, finally, who presides unseen at the Councils of the Church and bestows his light upon them" (AAS 35 [1943] 216).

And in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" the same Pius XII wonderfully extols the authenticity or authority of the Magisterium, saying: "This sacred Office of Teacher in matters of faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ our Lord the whole deposit of faith—Sacred Scripture and divine Tradition—to be preserved, guarded and interpreted... Together with the sources of positive theology God has given to His Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church" (AAS 42 [1950] 567-569). Against the advocates of an *autonomous lay theology*, the same Pius XII teaches: "Indeed on the contrary these points must be retained: namely, there never was, nor is there now, nor will there ever be in the Church a legitimate Teaching Authority of the laity, which has been detached by God from the authority, leadership and vigilance of the sacred Magisterium" (*Allocution "Si diligis"*: AAS 46 [1954] 317). See also the Encyclical "*Ad Sinarum gentem*": AAS 47 (1955) 10-11.

6. *Vatican Council I*, Draft 1: Msi 51,552; see c.9: Msi 51,542; Draft 2: Msi 53,316; see c.7: Msi 53,312-314.

515. Theological note. That the Magisterium of the Church was instituted divinely in the Apostles, that it is authoritative, to continue perpetually, infallible and traditional is at least implicitly *defined by Vatican Council I with a solemn judgment* in the places cited in n.512.

516. Proof 1. We presuppose as abundantly proved in the treatise *On Christ the divine Legate* (theses 28 and 29) that *Christ has been sent and acknowledged as an authentic Teacher*.

In the Gospels Christ is called a *Teacher* forty times, a *Rabbi* twelve times, while these titles are rarely attributed to other persons: they are attributed once to the Baptist (Luke 3:12), once to Nicodemus (John 3:10) and three times to the Scribes and Pharisees (Luke 3:46; 6:40; Matt. 10:24f.). From an analysis of these texts, in which the reference is to Christ as a Teacher, it is inferred that his Teaching is, with regard to the form, similar to, but with regard to the content totally superior to the teaching of others, whether in the authority with which he teaches or in the adherence that he demands. Indeed, the teaching of Christ appears to be superior to the teaching of Moses and the prophets (see Matt. 7:29; 23:8-10; John 1:17f.; 13:13-15). Hence from this it is clear that Christ has been sent and acknowledged as an authentic teacher.⁷

517. Proof 2. *Christ instituted an authentic and infallible Magisterium in his Apostles.* For, Christ handed over to the Apostles his own mission or the divine legation that he had as man. But Christ as a man was sent by God as an authentic and infallible Teacher. Therefore Christ instituted an authentic and infallible Magisterium in his Apostles.

The major was proved in thesis 2. For its proof it will suffice for now to remember the testimonies of John 17:18; 20:21; Matt. 10:40; Luke 10:16; Matt. 28:18-20. These testimonies were already explained in thesis 2.

518. The minor. a) That *Christ* was sent as an authentic *teacher* is clear from thesis 1.

b) It is certain that the doctrinal authority of Christ is *infallible*: 1) because *Christ himself* presents his *testimony* as absolutely true and demands that absolute faith be given to it, even under the risk of salvation (John 3:11-19); 2) because he teaches that his own doctrinal authority of a divine Legate comes from God himself (John 7:15-18). *St. John*, either the Evangelist or the Baptist (John 3:15-17), bears witness to the same

7. See Rengstorff, *Didaskalos*, Theol. Wört. z. N.T. 2,154-160; J. Salaverri, *La potestad del Magisterio eclesiástico*: EstEcl 29 (1955) 170-172.

thing, where he teaches both points, which we recounted from the mouth of Christ under numbers 1 and 2 above.

519. Proof 3. Christ instituted in the Apostles a Magisterium that will continue to exist perpetually. For, Christ promised absolutely his assistance for the Magisterium instituted in the Apostles *always, to the close of the age* (Matt. 28:20), and also the assistance of “the Paraclete, the Spirit of truth who will remain with them forever,” that is, as helper and protector who will “lead them into all truth” and he will do that perpetually and will never abandon them (John 14:16f.; 16:12f.). *He will give you another Counselor, to be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth, He will remain with you and He will be in you.*

520. Proof 4. *Christ instituted in his Apostles an infallible Magisterium.*⁸

a) From Matt. 28:18-20: *And behold, I am with you*, see Acts 18:10. When this solemn divine promise is given to someone in Scripture, in order to carry out some office or to accomplish some work that is assigned, it signifies protection or help of God promised absolutely and efficacious or a help that without fail obtains its effect. But the protection or help of God promised absolutely and efficaciously in order to teach the doctrine of Christ certainly and infallibly will obtain its effect. Therefore, under the assistance of Christ, the Apostles and their successor “to the close of the age” certainly and infallibly will teach the doctrine of Christ. See what we said in n. 300.

521. *The major* can be proved from the promises of help for an office or for performing some work which was made by God to Moses (Exod. 3:11-17), to Joshua (Josh. 1:5.9; 3:7). Jeremiah (Jer. 1:8.18.19), which are shown to be efficacious, that is, to those promises the effect followed without fail. The Angel in the Annunciation (Luke 1:28-36) attributed the same sense of efficacy to the words that “God is with someone,” and also to Nicodemus (John 3:2). Therefore, the solemn promise, made by Christ to the Apostles in Matt. 28:8-20, to carry out the office of teaching the doctrine of Christ, signifies protection or help promised absolutely by God and efficacious, or to which the effect will follow without fail.

The minor is clear, because the absolute and efficacious help of God must obtain the intended effect certainly and infallibly; for otherwise God himself could be accused of impotence, which is repugnant.

8. See especially H. Dieckmann, n.686-689; I. Ottiger, 2,8-17; F. Zorell, *N.T. Lexicon graecum* μετά and καί. See what we said in n.300. See U. Holzmeister, *Dominus tecum*: VerbDom 23 (1943) 232-237, 257-262.

522. b) From John 14:16f.26; 15:26; 16:12f.; Acts 1:8: According to this absolute promise of Christ, the Apostles continually will be taught by the Spirit of truth as by a Teacher and they will correctly learn the whole doctrine of Christ; assisted and strengthened by such help, they will proclaim it continually and faithfully to the end of the world. But a Magisterium blessed with such efficacious assistance from God cannot not be infallible. Therefore, Christ instituted in the Apostles an infallible Magisterium. See what we write in n. 301.

523. *The major* shows the things that are contained explicitly in the cited texts. *The minor* is clear, because if the Magisterium gifted with such efficacious assistance of God could err, its error would rightly have to be ascribed to God himself, as Leo XIII appropriately teaches: "If in any way it could be false [what the Magisterium teaches], God himself would be the author of error in man, which is clearly repugnant" (ASS 28,721). This same point can be confirmed from the teaching of St. Paul, when he mentions the assistance given to him by the Holy Spirit in order to teach efficaciously (1 Cor. 2:10-16).

524. c) From Mark 16:16; Matt. 10:14.15.40; Luke 10:10-16: Although St. Luke in the cited text seems to be referring to the 72 disciples, the same idea a fortiori applies to the 12 Apostles, as is clear from a comparison with St. Matthew in his text that is also cited, and because the reason is the same, namely, a *mission* received from Christ. Hence there is this argument: In the cited texts in Mark, Matt. and Luke Christ, under the risk of eternal salvation, absolutely obliged men to give intellectual assent that is absolutely certain to the Magisterium of the Apostles. But such obligation cannot be imposed by God unless it is to an infallible Magisterium. Therefore the Magisterium instituted by Christ in the Apostles is infallible.

525. Since the *major* is clear from a reading of the texts we have cited, it is necessary to prove the *minor*. For, if the Magisterium were not infallible, the obligation to give it *absolutely certain* intellectual assent would be in vain, since it would concern something impossible. But a vain obligation or one concerning something impossible cannot be imposed by a wise and just God. Therefore such an obligation cannot be imposed by God unless it is to an infallible Magisterium.

The major. An obligation for an absolutely certain intellectual assent towards a fallible Magisterium would be in vain or one concerning something impossible: for, the intellect, as a necessary power, cannot give

its *absolutely certain* assent unless it is because of a motive excluding the possibility of error, that is, unless it is because of the evidence of the object or because of the infallibility of the testimony.⁹

526. Confirmation. 5. *The Apostles are infallible in their words and deeds.*

For, the Apostles attribute infallible authority to themselves and they confirm their own teaching with miracles. Therefore the Apostles were really infallible.

The antecedent. 1) The Apostles attribute infallibility to themselves especially, because they testify that they are speaking in the name of God and are aided and strengthened by his divine assistance: thus the 12 Apostles: Acts. 4:8-14; 5:32; 15:28; thus also St. Paul: Rom. 15:18; 2 Cor. 13:3.

2) The Apostles confirm their own preaching with miracles: Acts 3:106; 5:12-16; so also St. Paul: Acts 19:8-12; 2 Cor. 12:11-12.

527. Scholium. *The Apostles in matters of faith and morals were personally and individually infallible.*¹⁰ The main reason for this assertion is, because St. Paul, by reason of his personal and immediate mission received from Christ, attributes infallibility to himself personally, with the approval of the other Apostles and by God confirming it with miracles. But the Apostolate of St. Paul was absolutely on an equal level with the Apostolate of the other Apostles. Therefore, each one of the Apostles in matters of faith and morals was infallible.

528. *The major* can be easily proved from the sources. It will be sufficient to mention a few: a) The reason for the personal infallibility of St. Paul is the efficacious assistance of God (Acts 18:10) and also the immediate and personal mission received from Christ: Gal. 1:1.12.16; 2 Cor. 11:5-23; 1 Thess. 2:4-7. b) St. Paul attributed to himself personal infallibility: Gal. 1:6-12; 2 Cor. 11:3f.; 1 Thess. 2:13; c) The other Apostles approve St. Paul's preaching: Gal. 2:6-10; 2 Pet. 3:15f. d) God confirmed with miracles the preaching and Apostolate of St. Paul: Gal. 3:5; 2 Cor. 12:12; 1 Thess. 1:5.

The minor has already been proved by us in thesis 2.

On the other extraordinary and personal gifts of the Apostles see what we wrote in n. 277-279 and in 382.¹¹

529. Objections.¹² 1. The proof taken from John 14:16f.; 15:26; 16:12f. is not efficacious. For, the promises to the Apostles at the Last Supper made by Christ apply to the Apostles only, but not to their successors: see John 14:25.28-30; 15:27; 16:5f. But they are the ones with which Christ promised the Apostles the assistance of the Holy Spirit. Therefore the assistance of infallibility applies to the Apostles alone, but not to their successors.

9. See especially D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif. Prolegomena* § 25, III.

10. See A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.211-219; H. Dieckmann, n.652-666, 691-693.

11. On other extraordinary gifts of the Apostles, see A. Straub, th.7; L. Lercher, n.285f.

12. See L. De San, *De Ecclesia* n.239-252; D. Palmieri, *loc.cit.*, § 39; I. Muncunill, n.299-307.

I distinguish the major. The promises made to the Apostles in view of their persons apply to the Apostles alone, *conceded*; the promises made to the Apostles by reason of the perpetual office instituted in them by Christ apply to the apostles alone, but not to their successors, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* The promise of the assistance of the Holy Spirit was made to the Apostles by reason of the perpetual office of teaching instituted in them by Christ, *conceded*; it was made only in view of the persons themselves of the Apostles, *denied*. And based on the given distinctions, *the consequent and the consequence are denied*.

530. 2. The assistance of the Holy Spirit is promised depending on the condition *if you love me* (John 14:15). Therefore it is not absolute, so if the condition is lacking the assistance can also be lacking.

I distinguish the antecedent. The assistance of the Holy Spirit is promised depending on a condition certainly and infallibly fulfilled or to be fulfilled, *conceded*; on a condition not fulfilled or whose fulfillment can be lacking, *denied*. The promise is made, as is clear from a reading of the texts, absolutely; but the condition, contained in 14:15, if it must be said to be a true condition, is shown either as already fulfilled or infallibly to be fulfilled, as is certain from John 14:19f.; 15:3f.9.14-16.19f.; 16:22-27.

531. 3. The argument taken from Mark 16:16 proves too much. Therefore it proves nothing. *Re the antecedent.* The stated argument would also prove that the last practical judgment of conscience is infallible, in this way: God under the risk of salvation obliges a man to follow the last practical judgment of his conscience. But such an obligation cannot be imposed unless it is based on an infallible judgment. Therefore the last practical judgment of conscience is infallible. But this conclusion is certainly false. Therefore also the conclusion of our argument is false.

I deny the antecedent and I deny that the last practical judgment of conscience is infallible, from the disparity which the following distinction makes clear: *I distinguish the major:* God under risk of salvation obliges a man to follow the last practical judgment of conscience, as a criterion of rectitude, *conceded*; as a criterion of truth, or to intellectually assist such a judgment as true, *denied*. *I concede the minor.* Similarly *I distinguish the consequent.* The last practical judgment of conscience is infallible, as a criterion of rectitude, *conceded*; as a criterion of truth, *denied*. Therefore he who follows the last practical judgment, infallibly proceeds in an upright manner, even if he is in error; but he who intellectually assents to a definitive judgment of the Magisterium of the Church infallibly avoids error.

532. 4. From Matt. 23:10: *Do not be called masters, for you have one Master, the Christ.* Therefore Christ himself denied that the Apostles can be called masters.

I distinguish the antecedent. Do not be called teacher and do not be called Master, inordinately, *conceded*; in an orderly manner, *I subdistinguish:* Your one Master is Christ, principally and internally, *conceded*; as helpers and externally other masters are excluded, *denied*. Based on the given distinctions, *the consequent and the consequence are denied*.

533. 5. From Isa. 53:13; see John 6:44-45: Concerning the messianic economy it is said: *All your sons shall be taught by the Lord*. Therefore all teaching of men is superfluous.

I distinguish the antecedent. It is said that the Lord himself is the Teacher of men from the heavenly Church, *I bypass the antecedent*: it is said that the Lord himself is the Teacher of men in a positive way, *conceded*; exclusively, *denied*.

534. 6. From Jer. 31:33f.; see Heb. 10:16; 2 Cor. 3:3. Concerning the New Covenant it is said: *I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts... and no longer shall each man teach his neighbor and each his brother, saying: Know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest*. Therefore in the Church every Teacher of men is excluded.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the Church man alone will not teach beyond [what has been revealed], *conceded*; no man will teach, *I subdistinguish*: in the heavenly Church, *I bypass this point*; in the earthly Church, *I subdistinguish*: no man will teach principally and internally, *conceded*; in a helping way and externally, *denied*.

535. 7. From 1 John 2:20f.27: *You have been anointed by the Holy One, and you all know... You have no need that anyone should teach you*. Therefore for the faithful all ministerial and external Magisterium is superfluous.

I distinguish the antecedent. The faithful have no need that anyone should teach them from those who would deceive them (1 John 2:26), *conceded*; they have no need that those in the Church who have obtained the power of the Magisterium should teach them, *denied*. For, in this very letter St. John himself is teaching the faithful as St. Augustine shrewdly pointed out (ML 35,2005).

536. 8. From 1 Cor. 2:15: *The spiritual man judges all things, but is himself to be judged by no one*. Therefore the Magisterium, at least for all the faithful, is superfluous.

I distinguish the antecedent. The spiritual man, or one who, endowed with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, holds the supreme power of the Magisterium of the Church, judges all things and is himself judged by no one, *conceded*; the spiritual man, or one who, having been born again of the Holy Spirit, is numbered among Christ's faithful, judges all things and is himself judged by no one, *I subdistinguish*: the spiritual man, inasmuch as he is opposed to the animal or carnal man, judges all things, but is himself not judged by anyone who is animal or carnal, *conceded*; the spiritual man, as one of Christ's faithful although adorned with sanctifying grace and the indwelling Holy Spirit, judges all things and is himself judged by no one, *denied*. According to St. Paul's way of speaking, a *spiritual man* is one living in grace, who is governed by a supernatural criterion; a man living according to the nature of an *animal*, is one who is led by the criterion of natural reason; finally, a *carnal man* is one living under rebellious concupiscence and he follows his inordinate desires.¹³

13. See S.Th., *In S.Pauli epistolas commentaria. In 1 Cor. c.2 lect.3.*

537. 9. The Apostles often erred. Therefore they were not personally infallible.

I distinguish the antecedent. In matters outside of the area of faith and morals or in teaching that is not certainly revealed, *I bypass this point*; in matters of faith and morals or in certainly revealed doctrine, *denied*. Thus it can be admitted that St. Paul erred, when he said that he would never again see the face of those whom he said Goodbye to at Miletus (Acts 20:25; see 1 Tim. 1:3; 2 Tim. 4:20); but there he is not talking about matters of faith and morals or about certainly revealed doctrine.

538. 10. The Apostles were convinced that the Lord was going to come soon for the last judgment. But the coming of the Lord for the last judgment is a revealed truth and it has not yet happened. Therefore the Apostles erred concerning something revealed.¹⁴

I distinguish the major. The Apostles were convince that the Lord certainly was going to come for the last judgment, *conceded*; that he was going to come soon, *I subdistinguish*: the Apostles were convinced that the Lord will come for the final judgment at an uncertain time but which could be near, *conceded*; that that future was near, *I subdistinguish*: the Apostles perhaps desired that the coming of the Lord for the last judgment would take place soon, *I bypass this point*; the Apostles asserted with a certain judgment that the coming of the Lord for the last judgment would take place soon, *denied*.

I also distinguish the minor. It is a revealed truth that the Lord will certainly come for the last judgment, *conceded*; that he will come soon, *I subdistinguish*: it is a revealed truth that the Lord will come for the last judgment at an uncertain time, which can be near, *conceded*; that that future is near, *I subdistinguish again*; it is a revealed truth that the Apostles perhaps desired that the coming of the Lord would happen soon, *I bypass this point*; it is a revealed truth that the Apostles with a certain judgment said that the coming of the Lord for the last judgment was going to take place soon, *denied*. And *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

539. The reason for these distinctions: a) *The Lord will certainly come for the judgment*: 1 Thess. 4:15-17; 1 Cor. 15:51-52; 1 Pet. 4:5-7; 1 John 2:18. b) *The coming of the Lord will be at an uncertain time, but it will be soon*: 1 Thess. 5:1-6; Matt. 24:36-44; 2 Pet 3:3-13.15. c) *The Apostles perhaps desired that Christ would come soon*: 2 Cor. 5:1-10; Phil.1:23; Rev. 22:20. d) *The Apostles were not able to say nor did they assert with a certain judgment* that the coming of the Lord for the last judgment would take place soon: Matt. 24:36-44; Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1-6; 2 Thess. 2:1-6; 2 Pet. 3:3-13; John 21:22-23. e) D 3628-3630.

14. See especially H. Dieckmann, n.694-706; I. Ottiger, 2,35-44.

CHAPTER II

On the perennial subject of the infallible Magisterium

ARTICLE I

THE INFALLIBILITY OF BISHOPS

Thesis 13. Bishops, successors of the Apostles, are infallible when in agreement with the Roman Pontiff they impose on the faithful a doctrine to be held definitively, whether in a Council or outside of a Council.

540. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 9; q. 5, a. 3; *Quodl.* 9, a. 16; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.7; St. R. Bellarmine, *De Conciliis* l.2 c.2-12; Wilmers, th.65-70; Palmieri, *Prolegomena de Ecclesia* § 27-28; Straub, th.24; D'Herbigny, n.392-393; Dieckmann, th.27; Zapelena, 2 (1954) th.17; Lercher, th.49.

541. Connection. In the preceding thesis we proved that Christ instituted in the Church an authentic Magisterium that is infallible and to last forever. Now we are asking what the subject is of this infallible Magisterium. Knowing from thesis 8 that the Bishops by divine law are the successors of the Apostles in their ordinary office, we deduce in this thesis that the College of Bishops is the subject of the infallible Magisterium.¹

542. Definition of terms. For the concept of infallibility and its divisions see thesis 12.

Bishops are those men in the Church who have sacred power that is full in its own nature. They can be either titular or residential. *Titular Bishops* are those who have only the ordinary power of Orders. *Residential Bishops* are the heads of the particular Churches, who have the ordinary office of ruling a certain flock of the faithful, with the full power of its own nature of teaching, sanctifying and governing. Residential Bishops are said to be the *successors of the Apostles*, as is clear from thesis 8.

543. We say that the Bishops are *concordant*, who in handing on the doctrine are in agreement among themselves, not only materially but also formally, that is, so that either explicitly or at least implicitly they are aware of their agreement.

1. On those in the Church who have the mission or office of teaching: CIC 1323.1326-1328 [1917]; *Constit. Apost.* Pius XI "*Deus scientiarum*" a.21f.; Pius XII, "*Si diligis*": AAS 46 (1954) 313-318.

The bishops teach *under the Roman Pontiff*, who, moved by the due affection of subordination towards him, propose some doctrine for their faithful, so that at least implicitly they know that they are adhering to the same doctrine, which the Roman Pontiff also teaches. Therefore, in addition to their subordination, consensus is required, which can be explicit, but it is sufficient if it is tacit.

The Bishops teach a doctrine *to be held definitively*, who with the highest grade of their authority require that the faithful give an irrevocable assent.

544. One way of exercising the Magisterium is extraordinary and the other is ordinary. The *extraordinary* way is that in which they exercise their Magisterium when they are united together in a Council under the Roman Pontiff. But the *ordinary* way is that in which the Bishops, continuing in community with the Roman Pontiff, exercise the Magisterium while dispersed throughout the world in their own dioceses.

545. A *Council* is an assembly of Bishops legitimately brought together to deliberate and make decisions about ecclesiastical affairs. It can be both Particular and Universal. A *Particular* Council is one that represents only a part of the College of Bishops. A *Universal* Council is one that includes the College of all Bishops. A Particular Council is called *Provincial* or *Plenary* if it consists of Bishops of one or of just some ecclesiastical provinces. It is called *National* or *Regional* if all the Bishops of a nation or region are joined together in it.

546. A *universal Council* can be either General or Ecumenical. A *General* Council is one that includes the Bishops of all the particular Churches. A General Council is said to be *Ecumenical* if it is accepted and confirmed by the Supreme Head of the Church, the Roman Pontiff. For an Ecumenical Council it is required and suffices that all the residential Bishops assemble together under the Roman Pontiff, not physically but morally, so that deservedly they are thought to represent the universal teaching Church.²

Therefore the ways of exercising ecumenical Magisterium, the *ordinary* form, or outside of a Council, and the *extraordinary* form, or in a Council, essentially agree in the fact that both are acts of the universal Church teaching under the Roman Pontiff; accidentally they differ in the fact that the extraordinary way involves further the local assemblage of the Bishops.

2. CIC 222-292 [1917]. St. Thomas says: "The Fathers gathered together in Councils can decree nothing unless it is done with the intervening authority of the Roman Pontiff; without that it cannot gather together as a Council" (*Contra impugnantes Dei cultum* p.2 c.25; edit. Vivès t.29 p.35).

547. State of the question. We are attributing infallibility to the Bishops, not to all, but to the residential; not to individuals, but as constituting a College and taking the place of the College of Apostles; not to those independent of the Head, but to those obedient to the Roman Pontiff and agreeing with him; not to those teaching in just any way, but to those agreeing formally among themselves and with their Head; not to those exercising just any kind of authority, but to those binding all the faithful to an assent that is completely firm and irrevocable. But the way in which Bishops exercise their own infallibility can be either ordinary, that is, outside of a Council and dispersed throughout the world, or extraordinary, that is, united together in an Ecumenical Council.

548. Adversaries. Besides those whom we mentioned in the preceding thesis 12, 1) Luther expressly denied the doctrine of our thesis (D 1477-1480; see D 1247-1251).

2) *The Jansenists* place the authority of a particular Doctor before the infallible authority of the Church (D 2330). The members of the Synod of *Pistoia* are opposed inasmuch as, besides the Bishops, they say that others are also judges of the faith, and they attribute decisive authority to a diocesan synod (D 2610-2611).

3) Then there are the *Legalists* and *Royalists* who hold that the definitions of the Church lack value unless they have been approved by the civil authority, taking the place of the people; nor do they fear to assert that the Ecumenical Councils have erred in defining matters of faith and morals (D 2923).

4) *The Schismatic Orientals* are opposed to us in the sense that they hold that the subject of infallibility is the College of equals with a Head, the Roman Pontiff, or any other Supreme Head.³

5) *Ecumenists* or contemporary *Pan-Christians* defend the complete independence of the Church, and although they have their "World Council of Churches," still they say expressly that the Council does not possess any legislative or judicial power to which the individual Church are subject; for, the Churches, they say, retain their own complete freedom to accept or reject the decisions of the "World Council of Churches."⁴

549. Doctrine of the Church. 1) *The infallibility of the teaching Church* in general is defined implicitly in *Vatican Council I*: "The doctrine of faith has been committed to the spouse of Christ to be faithfully kept and infallibly defined" (D 3020); [she possesses] "the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed in defining the doctrine concerning faith or morals" (D 3074). In these places "to define" and "to declare" evidently pertains to the *teaching Church* (see D 3000, 3069-3070); therefore

3. *Theol. dogmat. christ. Orientalium* 4, De Ecclesia (1931) 484-525; Msi 40,405-407.

4. *Minutes and Reports of the Third Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches* (Toronto [Canada] July 9-15, 1950) p.85-89; see *Irenikon* 24 (1951) 38f.44.

in them the infallibility of the Church teaching is proclaimed. Thus Bishop Gasser, in the name of the *Committee on Faith*, when explaining these words during the *Vatican Council*, said: "With no one objecting, it is heretical to deny the infallibility of the Church in defining dogmas of faith."⁵

550. 2) The infallibility of the Bishops in an Ecumenical Council is defined:

a) *Implicitly*, because the Councils themselves with supreme authority impose on all the faithful doctrine to be held or believed and they back up this obligation by damning under anathema those who think or believe otherwise: see *Council of Nicaea I* (D 125-126); *Council of Florence* (D 1300-1302); *Council of Trent* (D 1520, 1548-1550, 1635, 1649-1650, 1697-1700, 1725, 1869-1870); *Vatican Council I* (D 3000. 3050-3052).

b) *Explicitly*, because the supreme doctrinal authority of the Ecumenical Councils is openly defined or taught in a universal way. At the *Council of Constantinople II* the supreme authority of the first four Ecumenical Councils was defined (D 212 [34th ed.]); St. Gregory I compares the four Councils with the Gospels (R 2291); Leo IX in *Symbolo Firmiter* equated the seven previous Ecumenical Councils with the Gospels themselves (D 686); Pius IX in the *Syllabus* condemned those who said that the Ecumenical Councils erred in defining matters of faith or morals (D 2923).⁶

551. 3) The infallibility of the ordinary Magisterium, or outside of Councils, and of the *extraordinary Magisterium*, or in Ecumenical Councils, implicitly was defined in *Vatican Council I* (D 3011). This place, from the declaration made by Bishop Martin in the name of the Committee on Faith in the same Council, must be understood according to the *Apostolic Letter "Tuas libenter"* of Pius IX (D 2879 "For even if it were a matter..."), however the question must remain separate concerning the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff, which in this place the Fathers at the Vatican Council did not wish to touch either directly or indirectly.⁷

552. Archbishop Simor, in the name of the Committee on Faith, explained the meaning of this definition, when he said: "The paragraph *Porro fide divina* (D 3011) is directed against those who say that only that must be believed which the Council defined, and not

5. Msi 52,1227.

6. St. Gregory the Great equates the four first Ecumenical Councils with four books of the Gospels (R 2291). The seven first Ecumenical Councils were: *Nicaea I*, 325; *Constantinople I*, 381; *Ephesus*, 431; *Chalcedon*, 451; *Constantinople II*, 553; *Constantinople III*, 681; *Nicaea II*, 787. The infallible authority of these seven Councils is recognized also by the Orientals separated from the Roman Church, as is certain from Encyclical Letters of the Constantinople Synod, endorsed by 33 Orthodox Bishops in the year 1848: Msi 40,395. See F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 188.

7. Msi 51,224.322. The infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff was to be treated and de facto was treated in the following session, that is, session IV (D 3065-3075).

also that which the dispersed Church teaching with unanimous consent preaches and teaches as divinely revealed." Bishop Martin, in the name of the same Committee on Faith, determined further the meaning of the same definition, saying: "The reason why the word *universal* is added, is this, namely, lest anyone should think that in this place we are speaking about the infallible Magisterium of the Holy Apostolic See. For, in no way was it the intention of the Committee to touch either directly or indirectly on the question about the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff. Therefore, this word "universal" more or less signifies the same thing that the Holy Father expressed in his Apostolic Letter, namely, the Magisterium of the whole Church spread throughout the world." And from the same Letter of Pius IX the words *as having been divinely revealed* were borrowed and so were included in the definition, "namely, lest opinions, which are handed on in Catholic schools, even if they are certain, should be inserted into the doctrine of the faith; for, if it is said that the Church teaches something *as having been divinely revealed*, it is not possible that it is only an opinion of the Schools."⁸ Pius XII very much approves this interpretation of the Vatican definition.⁹

553. Theological note. Therefore the thesis is a matter of *implicitly defined faith*, especially in Vatican Council I, with regard to both parts, that is, regarding both the ordinary Magisterium and the extraordinary.

554. Proof. 1) **Both parts, that is, concerning both ordinary and extraordinary Magisterium**, treated together. Bishops are infallible when they teach as formal successors of the infallible College of Apostles. But Bishops, teaching under the conditions assigned by the thesis, teach as formal successors of the infallible College of Apostles. Therefore the Bishops, successors of the Apostles, are infallible, when in agreement with the Roman Pontiff they impose a doctrine to be held definitively by the faithful.

555. The major is clear: *From the concept itself of formal succession*, which is the substitution of the subject without any change in the law; therefore, Bishops teaching as formal successors of the infallible College, necessarily must teach with the same right, that is, infallibly. b) *From the cause of the infallibility*, for as successors of the Apostles, the Bishops enjoy the assistance of infallibility in teaching, which Christ absolutely promised the Apostles would continue perpetually, namely, in their successors (Matt. 28:18; John 14:16.26; 16:12-13; see thesis 12, n.519-523). Therefore, Bishops teaching as formal successors of the Apostles, with the highest grade of authority, exercise the Magisterium under the assistance of infallibility, that is, infallibly.

8. Msi 51,47,322. Concerning the Letter to which Bishop Martin alludes, see D 2879. See Vacant, *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Vatican. La Constit. "Dei Filius"* t.2 § 4 *La foi catholique et le Magistère de l'Eglise* p.82-123.

9. *Constit. Apost. "Munificentissimus Deus,"* by which the dogma of the Assumption was defined: AAS 42 (1950) 756f,769.

556. *The minor.* In the conditions which the thesis assigns, Bishops teach: a) as a College, because in agreement under the Roman Pontiff, b) with the highest grade of doctrinal authority, because they teach definitively, c) with an obligation imposed under the danger of salvation, because they impose a doctrine that must be held absolutely, d) the whole flock of the faithful, because all the residential Bishops are the ones who teach. Therefore, the Bishops, teaching under the conditions which the thesis assigns, teach as a College with the same supreme, peremptory, universal authority that was given to the Apostles by Christ; that is, they teach as the formal successors of the infallible College of Apostles.

557. But the conditions, which the thesis assigns, are verified equally well both in an Ecumenical Council and outside of such a Council. Therefore in the conditions, which the thesis assigns, Bishops are infallible, when they teach both in an extraordinary way or in an Ecumenical Council, and in an ordinary way or outside of a Council spread throughout the world.

558. *The antecedent.* A. The conditions of the thesis are verified in an Ecumenical Council.¹⁰

a) They teach *harmoniously* in it, because the agreement of the Bishops among themselves and with the Head, the Roman Pontiff, is that which primarily and per se is intended to be obtained in a Council, otherwise no decree is given.

b) The Bishops teach *under the Roman Pontiff* in a Council, because the approval and definitive confirmation of the Supreme Pontiff is so essential and necessary that without it absolutely nothing can be decided by a Council; for, a Council essentially and necessarily is the Body of Bishops under its Head, the Roman Pontiff, and without this Head neither a decree of an Ecumenical Council nor the Council itself can be conceived (see note 2).

559. c) *They define doctrine,* because this is proper to an Ecumenical Council—to establish definitive decrees, by which the doctrine to be held and believed is established, and to anathematize those who hold or believe the contrary opinion.

d) *They impose doctrine to be held,* because the Council with its decrees obliges the faithful to give an assent that is completely firm and irrevocable, and indeed under the danger of salvation, as is warned explicitly by the decrees themselves of an Ecumenical Council.

e) *They teach all the faithful,* because a Council, as Universal and Ecumenical, represents the whole teaching Church and it directs its decrees to

10. See below, n.573-581, Scholium 1, *De Concilio Oecumenico*.

the whole flock of the faithful.

Therefore, in an Ecumenical Council the conditions which our thesis states are manifestly verified.

560. *The antecedent.* B. The conditions of the thesis are verified also outside of a Council in the universal and ordinary Magisterium of the Bishops.

a) It can be well established from the communication of the Bishops among themselves, and especially with the Roman Pontiff, that all the Bishops teach with one mind, so that also their formal consensus is given.

b) It is clear from their communion and their communion with the Supreme Pontiff that the Bishops dispersed throughout the world teach *under the Roman Pontiff*, and this is so from their profession of due subordination and obedience towards him.

c) That doctrine is taught *definitively* by the Bishops, and d) that they impose it *absolutely to be held* can be easily proved from the formulas, whereby they both commend the gravity of the doctrine and insist on the obligation to give a firm and irrevocable assent.

d) It is clear that the Bishops are directed *to all the faithful*, because they are the agreeing Magisterium morally of all the Bishops of the Church.

Therefore also in the ordinary Magisterium of the Bishops dispersed throughout the world the conditions are verified, which our thesis requires.

561. 2) The infallibility of the ordinary Magisterium of the Bishops teaching outside of an Ecumenical Council **is proved**. For, Christ, when he sent the Apostles into the whole world to preach the Gospel, at the same time promised the assistance of infallibility that would continue until the end of the world, and he conferred such authority in teaching on them that all men, under the danger of salvation, are obligated to give their assent (Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:15). But these are the endowments of the ordinary and infallible Magisterium of the Apostles and of their successors dispersed throughout the world. Therefore, the ordinary Magisterium of the Bishops dispersed throughout the world is infallible.

562. 3) This last conclusion is confirmed. For, Christ attributed perennially to the College of Apostles infallibility without any restriction and for the ordinary direction of the faithful. But this would not be true if the College of Bishops were infallible only in an Ecumenical Council. Therefore, the College of Bishops is also infallible outside of a Council, or when it exercises the supreme Magisterium in the ordinary way.

The major is clear per se and from Matt. 29:18-20; Mark 16:15.

563. *The minor is proved easily*, because an Ecumenical Council is a means so extraordinary and difficult, that it can be celebrated rarely and often after the lapse of a long period of time:

For, the first Ecumenical Council (Nicaea I) was held in the year 325.

Between the 4th Ecumenical Council (Chalcedon, 451) and the 5th (Constantinople II, 553) there were 102 years.

Between the 5th and the 6th Ecumenical Councils (Constantinople II and III, in the years 553 and 680) there were 127 years.

Between the 6th Ecumenical Council (Constantinople III, 680) and the 7th (Nicaea II, 787) there were 107 years.

Between the 8th Ecumenical Council (Constantinople IV, 870) and the 9th (Lateran I, 1123) there were 253 years.

Between the 19th Ecumenical Council (Trent, 1563) and the 20th (Vatican I, 1870) there were 307 years.¹¹

564. Proof 4) From 1 Tim. 3:15: *In order that you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and bulwark of truth* Ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζώντος, στῦλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας.¹²

565. Indeed: a) These words are understood always by Catholics, and until the 16th century by all Christians, as being said about the universal Church. b) The Council of Trent, Gregory XVI, the Fathers in Vatican Council I understood the same words also as said about the universal Church in order to signify her immunity from error¹³; c) But Protestants abandoned this common interpretation of the text by Christians: and so some of them refer the words to those that follow, in which Paul is speaking about the mystery of the Incarnation, so that they would have Paul say that the mystery of the Incarnation is the pillar and bulwark of the truth; but others think the same words are to be referred either to Timothy or to the particular Church of the Ephesians.

566. On the contrary, it is necessary to say: a) that these words cannot be referred to those that follow, for the ancient unanimous interpretation forbids this, and also the traditional punctuation of the text, which Protestants inconsiderately are forced to change, contrary to the sound tradition of the text which has been accepted by most commentators; b) St. Paul cannot suitably refer the same words to Timothy, for the natural meaning of the text does not allow this, nor does it agree with what St. Paul himself says about Timothy, since he describes him rather as weak in character and needing to be instructed and strengthened by St. Paul; therefore he cannot at the same time call him the pillar and bulwark of the truth (see

11. See below, n.573-581, Scholium 2, *De Concilio Oecumenico*.

12. See on 1 Tim. 3:15 the commentators, for example St. Thomas, Knabenbauer, M. Sales, Pirot-Bardy. See also F. Zorell, *N.T. Lexicon graecum*: στῦλος ἐδραῖωμα ἀλήθεια.

13. *Council of Trent*: D 1637; the Fathers at Vatican Council I: Msi 53,313; Gregory XVI: D 1617 [34th ed.]; Pius XI: D 3686; Pius XII, "*Munificentissimus Deus*": AAS 42 (1950) 767. Pius IX said: "The Catholic Church, which has always been taught by the Holy Spirit, is the pillar and bulwark of the truth": Bull "*Ineffabilis Deus*": CL 6,836 c.

1 Tim. 4:11-16; 2 Tim. 1:6-9; 2:1-7; 4:1-5); c) finally, in particular, these words of St. Paul cannot be understood as referring to the Church of the Ephesians, because for him the phrase "Church of God" is used to signify the whole Church, and because regarding that particular Church St. Paul cannot aptly and absolutely say that it is the pillar and bulwark of the truth, as is clear from the solicitude with which the Apostle strives to instruct Timothy about the proper way to govern and strengthen it.¹⁴

567. That being the case, we argue: The Church is said by St. Paul absolutely to be the pillar and bulwark of the truth. But this necessarily implies infallibility. Therefore, the Church is said by St. Paul implicitly to be infallible. But the Church cannot be called infallible, unless those in it who have the hierarchical office of teaching, that is, the Bishops, in the conditions which the thesis assigns, are infallible. Therefore, the Bishops teaching in the conditions which the thesis assigns are infallible.

568. The subsumed *minor* is explained: For, the bishops, as successors of the Apostles, have their hierarchical office of teaching, which the faithful are bound to obey; indeed, if the Bishops teaching in the conditions of supreme authority, which the thesis assigns, could err, then the whole Church of the faithful would either follow them in the error, or not; if the first case, then the Church would not be confirmed in the truth and therefore could not be said to be the bulwark of the truth; if the second case, the Church would be lacking in unity and hierarchical subordination, nor could it then be said to be simply the pillar and bulwark of the truth, since it would be defective and perishable. Therefore, the Church cannot truly be said to be infallible unless the Bishops, in the conditions which the thesis assigns, are infallible.

569. The thesis is confirmed 5) by the authority of the Fathers.

St. Ignatius the Martyr said in his letter to the Ephesians 3,2: "I prefer to warn you to be united in the teaching of God. For, Jesus Christ, our inseparable life, is the word of the Father, just as also the Bishops, constituted in various places, are of one mind with Jesus Christ. Hence it is fitting that we agree with the teaching of the Bishop, which you also do."¹⁵

570. St. Irenaeus teaches: a) that the highest criterion of revealed truth is the consensus of the Bishops (R 242); b) that the consensus of the Bishops necessarily must agree with the thinking of the Roman Pontiff (R 209-210).

Tertullian holds: a) that the criterion of revealed truth is the agreeing thought of the Bishops (R 293, 295); b) that the Roman Church guards "the whole teaching" of the Apostles (R 297).

Origen said: "That alone is to be accepted as truth which differs in no respect from ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition" (R 443).

14. See thesis 3, where we show that the designation "Church of God" is used in the N.T in a universal sense; F.M. Braun, *Nuovi aspetti del problema della Chiesa* (1943) 38-45; K.L. Schmidt, *Die Kirche des Urchristentums: Festgabe für Adolph Deissmann* (1927) 259-319. For the universal sense of this designation in St. Paul, see 1 Cor. 1:1; 10:32; 11:22; 15:19; 2 Cor. 1:1; Gal. 1:13; Eph. 3:10; 1 Thess. 1:1; 2:14; 2 Thess. 1:1-4; 1 Tim. 3:5-15.

15. F.X. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* 1,216; see R 38.

571. St. Ambrose said: "Neither death nor the sword can separate me from the Council of Nicaea" (R 1250).

St. Augustine said: "Regarding those other observances which we keep and all the world keeps, and which do not derive from Scripture but from tradition, we are given to understand that they have been ordained or recommended to be kept by the Apostles themselves, or by plenary councils, whose authority is well founded in the Church" (R 1419). And elsewhere: "This same is the holy Church, the one Church, the true Church, the catholic Church, fighting against all heresies: fight, it can; but it cannot be overcome. As for heresies, they all went out of it, like unprofitable branches pruned from the vine: but itself abides in its root, in its Vine, in its charity" (R 1535).

572. St. Leo the Great: "Concerning the protection of the statutes of the holy Fathers, which were fixed with inviolable decrees at the Nicene Synod, I wish to remind you of the observance of Your Holiness" (R 2185). He wrote these words to the Bishops at the Council of Chalcedon.

St. Gregory the Great: "I confess that I receive and revere, as the four books of the Gospel so also the four Councils,... because they have been constituted by universal consent... Whosoever, therefore, thinks otherwise, let him be anathema" (R 2291).

573. Scholium 1. On the Ecumenical Council.¹⁶ 1) *An important law* is expressed in CIC cn.222-229 [1917], where especially the parts are established, which in an Ecumenical Council belong to its Head, the Roman Pontiff; the proper offices of the members of the Council are defined; and the supreme authority of an Ecumenical Council is carefully determined, plus its relation to the primatial power of the Supreme Pontiff.

574. 2) *The theological foundation* of the Ecumenical Council is the divine institution of the College of Apostles. For, Christ instituted the College of Apostles as a Body of Heads, that is, composed of St. Peter the Head and the Apostles as members, in order to continue his work on earth in an effective way. The Apostles exercised their office under Peter, either in the ordinary way dispersed throughout the world, or united together in an extraordinary way, namely, in the Council of Jerusalem: Acts 15:6-35.

575. 3) *The nature of the right* or of the power of an Ecumenical Council is formal succession. For, the College of Bishops formally succeeds the College of Apostles, which therefore is also the Body of the Heads, that is, being composed of the Head, the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter, and the member Bishops as successors of the Apostles. Bishops exercise their office under the Roman Pontiff, either in the ordinary way dispersed throughout the

16. See H. Dieckmann, n.733-741; Ae. Dorsch, 291; L. Lercher, n.468-473; F.X. Wernz-P. Vidal, *Ius Canonicum* t.2 n.455-463; H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* p.337-367.

world, or united together in an extraordinary way in an Ecumenical Council. By divine law, therefore, there are two essential elements in the College and consequently in a Council: The first is the Head, who is the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy; the second is the Body, which is constituted by the Bishops, successors of the Apostles, and they are this *by right (de iure)* physically all of them, but *de facto* all morally.

576. 4) *The idea:* An Ecumenical Council is, therefore, a legitimate assembly of all the Bishops gathered together under the Roman Pontiff in order to deliberate and make decrees on ecclesiastical affairs. Bishops, who come together in a Council by their own right, are the residential Bishops or the successors of the Apostles; *all* must come together either *physically* or *morally*, according as the meeting is understood to be either *by right* or *de facto*. Briefly: An Ecumenical Council is a hierarchical body of the Bishops of the Church brought together under the Primate (see D 660).

577. 5) *The convocation of an Ecumenical Council requires:* a) concerning the Head, that it is acknowledged that the right of convoking it pertains to the Roman Pontiff alone (D 1445); b) concerning the Body, that the invitation to attend is extended to all the Bishops who are ordinary pastors of the Churches in communion with the Supreme Pontiff. By Ecclesiastical law others can also be invited, but not on the basis of their own right (D 2610).

578. 6) *The celebration of an Ecumenical Council requires:* a) on the part of the Head, that it is recognized that the right of presiding and directing the Council pertains to the Roman Pontiff alone (D 306); b) on the part of the Body, that the Bishops come together in such numbers and from so many parts of the world that, according to a moral estimation, they are thought to represent the whole College of Bishops. This moral estimation is to be made in light of the facts.¹⁷

579. 7) *The confirmation of an Ecumenical Council requires:* a) on the part of the Head, that the Supreme Pontiff definitively confirms its decrees and does it with a formal act either antecedently or concomitantly or consequently; b) on the part of the Body, that all the Bishops united together in the Council morally agree with the Supreme Pontiff confirming the decrees.

580. 8) *De facto*, the Council in which Ecumenism stood out more clearly was without doubt Vatican I. For in it, under the direction of the Supreme Pontiff, of the 1,050 Bishops, who were by right able to attend, 747 actually came; of the 11 Patriarchs 10 were present; of the 11 Primates 10 were present; of the 127 Archbishops in session III 107 were present, of whom 53 were from Europe, 23 from the Greek Orient, 16 from America. In the same session III, of the 529 Bishops 456 voted, of whom 297 were from Europe, 73 from America, 9 from Africa. For data on the other Ecumenical Councils, see the following scholium, n.582.

17. See H. Dieckmann, n.733-736,

581. 9) General Councils are called those that by reason of the Body, or by reason of the number and signification of the Bishops, morally represent the universal Body of their College, but for whose decrees the Head is lacking, namely, the confirmation of the Roman Pontiff. Such are thought to be the *Council of Sardis* held in Illyricum in the year 347, the *Council of Pisa* in 1409, and the *Council of Basel* held in the years 1431-1434.1437.1443.

10) *Particular Councils* are meetings of several Bishops, convened legitimately, in order to decide about ecclesiastical affairs.

It is required a) *that there are several bishops*; therefore *diocesan synods*, which are to be celebrated every ten years by each bishop with his own clergy, are not *Councils*, because in them there is only one legislator and judge, the Ordinary of the place or Diocese (CIC 356-62 [1917]). It is a *Provincial Council* if it pertains to one province, but it is called *Plenary* if it is held by two or several ecclesiastical provinces.

It is required b) that the meeting of Bishops be *legitimately convoked*, that is, according to the conditions required by law, of which the main ones are that the convoking and presidency for a Provincial Council is carried out by the Metropolitan, but for a Plenary one by a Legate of the Supreme Pontiff, and that before promulgation the Acts of the Council are to be approved by the Holy See (CIC 281-91 [1917]). Therefore neither the *Conferences*, as they are called, of Bishops of several provinces of Bishops, nor associations of Bishops of the same province, summoned every five years (CIC 292 [1917]) are *Councils*.

It is required c) that *the decrees are about ecclesiastical matters*. For, concerning merely profane things, Councils as such have no authority; but concerning ecclesiastical affairs "promulgated decrees of plenary and provincial Councils are obligatory in the whole territory of each Bishop" (CIC 291 § 2 [1917]), and indeed with an obligation corresponding to the episcopal authority. Therefore the *subjects* of the Bishops, who in Councils of this kind have prescribed something, are bound regarding the *disciplinary* decrees to obey them with religious *obedience*, and regarding the *doctrinal decrees*, although they are fallible, *to give them intellectual assent* (CIC 1326 [1917]). But with the approval of the *Congregation of the Council* they do not have more authority than that, unless in a special way they have been acknowledged as acts of the *Supreme Pontiff* himself, as happened, for example, in the Councils of *Milevitanus II* (416) and *Carthage XVI* (418) by Pope Zozimus and also *Orange II* (529) which was confirmed by Boniface II (D 222-230, 370-397).¹⁸

N.B. Concerning the following n.582: The data we present in this outline are either certain or at least more probable. See Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des Conciles* I p.1-124; J. Forget, *Concile*: DTC; H. Kilber, *Theologia Wirceburgensis*, I De principiis theologicis, d.2 c.2 p.162-230. There is in Kilber, p.145-162, a series of all the Councils, both general and particular, according to the chronological order of Harduini, up to the middle of the 18th century.

The meaning of the abbreviations: Ab. = Abbot; ca. = about; Card. = Cardinal; ctra. = against; Dc. = Deacon; Ep. = Bishop; Eps. = Bishops; Ip. = Emperor or Empress; Oc. = Western; Or. = Oriental; Pb. = Presbter; Pbs. + Presbyters; plur. = several; Pr. = Prelates.

18. See Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.716f. For more information on the obligation of giving assent to authentic decrees, even though they are fallible, see below in n.674-676.

582. Scholium 2. ECUMENICAL COUNCILS

Council	Year	Convoked by	Celebrated under Pope
1. Nicaea I	325	Constantius I	<i>Sylvester I</i> , who presided by Hosius Ep. Vitus & Vincent Pb.
2. Constantin. I	381	Theodotius I	<i>Damasus</i> , who was not present
3. Ephesus	431	Theodotius II	<i>Celestine</i> , presided by Archadius & Proiectus Eps. Philip Pb
4. Chalcedon	451	Pulcheria Ip.	<i>Leo I</i> pres. by Pascasius & Luc-Entius Eps. Bonifac. Pb.
5. Constantin. II	553	Justinian I	<i>Vigilius</i> , who refused to be Present
6. Constantin. III	680	Constantin. IV	<i>Agathon</i> , who sent Theodore & Georgius Pbs. John Pb.
7. Nicaea II	787	Irene Ip.	<i>Hadrian I</i> , who sent Peter Pb. & Peter Ab.
8. Constantin IV	870	Basil Ip.	<i>Hadrian II</i> , who sent Donatus & Stephen Eps. Marinus Dc.
9. Lateran I	1123	Callistus II	<i>Callistus II</i> , directed by him
10. Lateran II	1139	Innocent II	<i>Innocent II</i> , directed by his legates.
11. Lateran III	1179	Alexander III	<i>Alexand. III</i> , directed by his legates.
12. Lateran IV	1215	Innocent III	<i>Innocent III</i> , directed by his legates.
13. Lyons I	1245	Innocent IV	<i>Innocent IV</i> , directed by his legates.
14. Lyons II	1274	Gregory X	<i>Gregory X</i> , directed by his legates.
15. Vienne	1312	Clement V (Avig.)	<i>Clement V</i> , directed by his legates.
16. Constance	1414-1418	Segismund Ip.	<i>Gregory XII</i> and <i>Martin V</i> .
17. Florence	1438-1445	Eugene IV	<i>Eugene IV</i> , directed by him or by his legates.
18. Lateran V	1512-1517	Julius II	<i>Julius II</i> and <i>Leo X</i> , directed by their legates
19. Trent	1545-1563	Paul III	<i>Paul III</i> , <i>Julius III</i> , <i>Pius IV</i> , directed by their legates.
20. Vatican I	1870	Pius IX	<i>Pius IX</i> , directed by his legates.

	Confirmed by	Attendees	Main concern
	by <i>Sylvester I</i>	ca.318 Ep. Or.	On the consubstantiality of the Word against Arius.
	In 382 or after 490	ca.186 Ep. Or.	Only On the divinity of the Hl. Spirit against Macedonians
	by <i>Celestine III</i>	ca. 350 Ep. Or.	On one Person in Christ citra. Nestorius, and on grace citra. Pelagius
	by <i>Leo I</i>	ca.600 Ep. Or. & Pr.	On distinction of two natures in Christ ctra. Eutyches, monophysite.
	by <i>Vigilius</i> or <i>Gregory I</i> in 591	ca. 150 Ep.Or.	On Origenism & the three chapters of Theodore, Theodoretus & Ibae.
	by <i>Leo II</i> in 682	ca. 174 Ep. Or.	On two wills in Christ against the Monotheletists & Monoergetes.
	by <i>Hadrian I</i> or after	ca. 300 Ep.Or. & Pr.	On cult of images citra. Iconoclasts. 866
	by <i>Hadrian II</i>	ca. 102 Ep. Or.	On the rule of faith against various errors & on deposing Photius.
	by <i>Callistus II</i>	ca. 300 Pr. Oc.	On Investiture, discipline, morals.
	by <i>Innocent II</i>	ca. 1,000 Pr. Oc.	On discipline, morals, ctra. Schisms.
	by <i>Alexander III</i>	300 Ep. Oc. 400 Pr.	On election of Pope & ctra. Albigensians or Cathars.
	by <i>Innocent III</i>	412 Ep. Oc. 388 Pr.	On morals & discipline, & citra. Waldens., Albigen. & Joachim.
	by <i>Innocent IV</i>	140 Ep. Oc. plur. Pr.	On discipline & deposit. Fred. II.
	by <i>Gregory X</i>	500 Ep. 570 Pr.	On union with Greeks (Thom. & Bonaventure invited).
	by <i>Clement V</i>	114 or 300? Oc.	On discipline, suppress Templars, citra. Beg. & Beguin. & Olivi.
	by <i>Martin V</i>	32 Card. 183 Ep. 100 Ab 350 Pr.	On curing West. Schism and on the errors of Wycliffe & Hus.
	by <i>Eugene IV</i>	150 Ep. Oc. several Ep. Or.	On union of Orient. signed union formula. Epi. 115 Oc. 33 Or.
	by <i>Leo X</i>	115 Ep. Oc.	On reform of Church & peace of Kings. citra.Neo-Aristotelism.
	by <i>Pius IV</i>	Begin 70 Ep., then 252 at last session	On dogma citra. Protestants, & on discipline & reform of Church.
	by <i>Pius IX</i>	747 Ep. from five parts of the world	On faith & Church ctra. Rationalists, semiration. & Gallicans.

583. Scholium 3. The exercise of the ordinary infallible Magisterium is very frequent. Hence from the beginning of the Church down to our own times Bishops have used it to prescribe Symbols of the faith to be professed by adults before the reception of Baptism; to urge a grave obligation of the profession of the truth faith on their flocks; to correct and refute grave errors in matters of faith and morals which often occur in the passage of time; to declare and urge the grave obligation by which the faithful are bound to embrace the solemn definitions of the Supreme Pontiffs and of Ecumenical Councils; in a word, to guard, propose and explain for their faithful matters of faith and morals, which *are thought to be necessary for their common moral and religious instruction*. But on the more difficult questions of faith and morals, concerning which serious controversies arise among Christians, it is proper to the *extraordinary Magisterium* to give an infallible judgment, which takes place by a solemn judgment either of an Ecumenical Council or of the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra*.¹⁹

584. Objections.²⁰ 1. Individual Bishops are fallible. Therefore also the consensus of all of them under the Roman Pontiff is fallible.

I concede the antecedent. I distinguish the consequent. The consensus of all Bishops under the Roman Pontiff would be fallible if the divine assistance of infallibility promised to such consensus were not added to it, *conceded*; and based on this distinction, *I deny the consequent*.

2. All Bishops, under the Roman Pontiff, endowed also with the divine assistance, freely enter into agreement. Therefore they can agree to something erroneous.

I distinguish the antecedent. All Bishops, under the Roman Pontiff, endowed also with divine assistance freely enter into agreement, with the freedom of contradiction, *conceded*; with the freedom of contrariness, *I subdistinguish*: but so that under the under the efficacious assistance of God, they do indeed agree on the truth, but inflexibly, *conceded*; but so that under the efficacious assistance of God consequently they can assent to error, *denied*. Based on the given distinction, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*. This consent in truth that is free, but at the same time inflexible, under the efficacious assistance of God, can be explained in various ways, according to the different systems of theologians, which were developed in order reconcile man's freedom with the efficacious grace of God.

585. 3. The judgment of the Church Teaching depends on the previous investigation of the truth. But in the previous investigation of the truth the Church Teaching can be in error. Therefore also the judgment of the Church Teaching is fallible.

19. V. Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.101; J. Bellamy, *La Théol. Cathol. au XIX^e siècle* p.233-42; A. Vacant, *Etudes théol. sur les Const. du Vatic. 2* n.621-764; H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* p.446-453, 534-536.

20. I. Muncunill, n.299-307; Ph. Alonso Bárcena, *De Magisterio* th.5.

I distinguish the major. The judgment of the Church Teaching depends on the previous investigation of the truth, as a condition without which a judgment cannot be made licitly, *conceded*; as a condition without which such a judgment cannot be made validly, *denied*. *I bypass the minor and distinguish the consequent.* The judgment of the Church Teaching would be fallible, if it depended on the previous investigation of the truth as a condition, without which it could not be made validly, *conceded*; if it depended on a previous investigation only as a condition, without which it could not be made licitly, *denied*.

Since the Magisterium of the Church was instituted by Christ to guard and declare the deposit of faith, the Church Teaching has a grave obligation to inquire carefully into what is contained in the sources of revelation, before it imposes a decision on the faithful that is to be held definitively. But if she should fail in this obligation, certainly she would be acting illicitly; however, her judgment would have value and would be infallible, in virtue of the efficacious assistance of God promised absolutely, and because of which a definitive judgment of the Magisterium is infallible.

586. 4. An infallible Magisterium could oblige the faithful to make an internal intellectual assent. But the Church cannot oblige the faithful to make internal acts. Therefore, in the Church there cannot be an infallible Magisterium.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. The Church cannot oblige the faithful to perform internal acts, by the power of teaching, *denied*; by the power of governing, *I subdistinguish*: indirectly, *denied*; directly, *I subdistinguish again*: with its own proper power, *I bypass this point*; with the vicarious power of God, *denied*. And based on the given distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

587. 5. After the universal preaching of the Apostles and after the inspired writings of the N.T. handed on to the Church by the Apostles, there is no necessity for an infallible Magisterium. Therefore after the death of all the Apostles there is no infallible Magisterium in the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. After the preaching of the Apostles and after the inspired writings of the N.T., there would be no necessity for an infallible Magisterium, if its purpose were to perfect or complete or increase the deposit of revelation accepted from the Apostles, *conceded*; if its purpose is to guard and declare and explain the deposit of revelation received from the Apostles, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. After the death of all the Apostles there is no Infallible Magisterium in the Church, whose purpose is to perfect, complete and increase the deposit of revelation received from the Apostles, *conceded*; to guard or declare or explain the deposit of revelation received from the Apostles, *denied*. And *I deny the consequence*.

588. St. Gregory Nazianzen said²¹: "I am of the opinion that I should flee from every meeting of Bishops, because I have not seen the end of any Council as happy and auspicious; instead of getting rid of evils they seem rather to add to them and increase

21. St. Gregory Nax., *Epist.* 130 *ad Procopium* ca.381: MG 37,225.

them. For there are always rivalries and desires of dominating others." Therefore he does not seem to acknowledge the infallible authority of a Council.

I concede the antecedent and distinguish the consequent. St. Gregory is speaking about particular Councils, *conceded*; he is speaking about one Council, which was recognized as Ecumenical, when he wrote this letter about the year 381, *I subdistinguish*: he is complaining about the abuses which because of human weakness can occur and because of "rivalries and desires of dominating others" happen also in Ecumenical Councils, *conceded*; he has doubts about the infallibility of the Ecumenical Council, Nicaea I, *denied*.

589. 7. St. Augustine said in the year 400²²: "Who does not know that the Councils themselves, which are held in various regions and provinces, defer without any ambiguities to the authority of plenary Councils which are held by the whole Christian world; that the prior Councils often are amended by the later ones, since with some experience of things that is opened which was closed, and that is known which was hidden? Therefore, St. Augustine held not only that particular Councils but also plenary ones are subject to error, which it is necessary to correct.

I concede the antecedent and distinguish the consequent. St. Augustine held that particular Councils are fallible, *conceded*; St. Augustine held that the two Ecumenical Councils, Nicaea I and Constantinople I, held before the year 400 when he was writing, are subject to correction, *I subdistinguish*: St. Augustine held that the decrees of the Ecumenical Councils are subject to a declaration and explanation by later Councils, *conceded*; they are subject to correction from error, *denied*.

590. *The Council of Constance* defined: "Everyone is bound to obey the power of the Council, of whatever status or dignity, even if he is papal" (D 1247f.). Therefore the Council of Constance erred.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Council of Constance defined that a doubtfully legitimate Pope or one erring as a private person is bound to obey the Council, *I bypass the antecedent*; it defined that a Pope doubtfully legitimate or teaching *ex cathedra* is simply subordinated to a Council, *I subdistinguish*: the Council of Constance defined this as an Ecumenical Council or as confirmed by the Supreme Pontiff, *denied*; it defined this as merely a General Council, *I bypass this point*.

N.B. In the objections that can be raised from the Councils against the subject of infallibility, the historical circumstances should be kept in mind and three things should be noted well: *first*, whether or not the defining subject really is an Ecumenical Council or one confirmed by the Roman Pontiff; *second*, whether or not the object of the definition is a matter of faith or morals; *third*, whether or not the form of decision is really a definitive judgment. For, an infallible act is not given unless three things certainly concur: namely, the subject, object and form, which are required.²³

22. St. Augustine, *De Baptismo* 2,3,4: ML 43,128; CSEL 51,178.

23. For the objections from history against Councils, see H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* p.367-374.

ARTICLE II

THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE SUPREME PONTIFF

Thesis 14. The Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, possesses the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed the Church to be endowed (Vatic. Conc. D 3074)

591. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a.10; *De pot.* q.10, a. 4 ad 13; St. R. Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pont.* 4 c.1-14; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.8; Camo, *De locis* 6 c.1-8; J. Sáenz de Aguirre, *Auctoritas infallibilis Cathedrae S. Petri* (1683); Thirsus González, *De infallibilitate Romani Pontificis* (1689); Palmieri, th.25-36; Straub, n. 970; Dieckmann, n.748; D'Herbigny, n.394; Billot, th.31-32; Muncunill, n.443; Wilmers, n.228; De Groot, q.16 a.5f.; Schulte, a.49f.; De Guibert, n.299; Lercher, n.483; Zapelena, th.18; Dorsch, th.21. *De Doctrina Conc. Vatic.*, see Th. Granderath, *Constitutiones Conc. Vatic.* 165-200, 230-234; P. Ballerini, *De infallibilitate pontificis*: Mig., *Theol. Curs.* III 1168-1264.

592. Connection. We have proved that the College of Bishops as formally succeeding the College of Apostles enjoys the prerogative of infallibility. Now we ask further whether or not the Roman Pontiff as *the formal successor of St. Peter in the Primacy* over the whole Church possesses the same prerogative of infallibility. In the thesis we answer in the affirmative.

593. The Roman Pontiff. This denomination is taken in the sense in which in Vatican Council I it was explained against the Gallicans by the Secretary for the faith: namely, it is understood not as the Chair, but as the person sitting in the Chair; and not only as the total series of those occupying the Chair, but also singly or each individual person legitimately occupying Chair of Peter. He is not taken as a private person, but as a public person, and also not as the Bishop of a particular Church of the City of Rome nor as the Patriarch of the Western Church, *but in reduplicative way as the successor of St. Peter in Primacy over the whole Church*: D 3065, 3071, 3072.¹

594. We have other explicit notions of the thesis in the definition itself of the Vatican Council: D 3073-3074. *When he speaks ex cathedra*: This scholastic expression was taken especially from the Cyprianic notion of "the Chair of Peter." It seems that the first ones to use it were equivalently M. Cano, but formally F. Suarez. It was inserted into the decree of the Vatican Council, because several Fathers of the Council and the Archbishop

1. See Msi 52,21-22, 1212-13.

of Granada expressly asked for it.²

To speak ex cathedra, according to Vatican I (D 3073-3074), implies that the Roman Pontiff teaches something under a fourfold necessary condition: namely, as a Teacher who is *universal, supreme, defining* and it is *in matters of faith or morals*.

1. Fulfilling the office of the universal Pastor and Teacher of all the faithful;
2. Exercising authority given to him in the Apostle Peter on the highest level;
3. Proposing doctrine on faith or morals of the universal Church of Christ;
4. And defining it as something that must be held, that is, obliging all to an absolute assent of the mind and deciding the matter with an ultimate and irrevocable judgment.³

595. *He possesses the infallibility with which the Christ willed his Church to be endowed.* With this expression we are asserting the same thing that the Vatican Council intended to define directly and per se against the Gallicans, namely, that the equality is the same between the infallibility of the Pontiff and the infallibility of the Church; for the same infallibility is asserted:

- 1) *by nature*, or immunity from error, not only factually, but also by right (D 3069 "Therefore the Bishops of the whole world...").
- 2) *by its cause*, or by reason the divine assistance the impossibility of erring (D 3070 "For the Holy Spirit...");
- 3) *by its value*, or "they are irreformable of themselves, not because of the consent of the Church" or they obtain definitive value (D 3074).

2. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 43.55.59; R 573, 575, 580; M. Cano, *De Locis* 1.6 c.7; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.8 n.4; *Defensio fidei* 1.1 c.5; *De religione* tr.10 l.3 c.4 n.5; *Conc. Vatic.*: Msi 52,829.1126.1128.1130-32.1134.1139.1140.1143.1145-48.1153.1166.1167.1169.1178.1179.1182.1183.1193.1194.1222.1225. See L. Godefroy, *Ex Cathedra*: DTC 5,1731; P. Batiffol, *Cathedra Petri* (1938).

3. The Archbishop of Granada proposed that it say "he defines and decrees," because, as he said: "The Roman Pontiff is not only infallible when *he defines*, or pronounces a definitive judgment concerning questions raised among the faithful; but also when on his own initiative *he decrees* and proposes to all Christ's faithful those doctrines of faith or morals, which he has judged in the Lord to be necessary for the good of the Church" (Msi 52,1296). The Secretary, Bishop Grasser, in the name of the Committee for Faith responded to him and to others making similar objections explaining the word *he defines*: "That word," he said, "should not be taken in the legal sense that it signifies only the end put to a controversy, which has been raised concerning matters of faith or morals; but the word *he defines* signifies that the Pope directly and finally has given his judgment concerning a doctrine which has to do with matters of faith and morals, so that now each member of the faithful knows with certainty from the Roman Pontiff that this or that doctrine is held to be heretical, proximate to heresy, certain or erroneous, etc." (Msi 52,1316).

- 4) *by the object*, whose extent the Vatican Fathers explained with this phrase, so that, for example, in the object generically enuntiated through the words, "doctrine on faith or morals" is expressed clearly "that the infallibility of the Pontiff extends to the same area of truths, and it extends not more nor less broadly than the infallibility of the Church," as was stated expressly by the Secretary for the Faith.⁴

596. Adversaries. 1) *In general* all those who deny either the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff or the infallibility of the Church.

2) *In particular* the promoters and advocates of the theory of *Conciliarism* or of the authority of a General Council over the Pope are opposed to the thesis. These were a) since the 9th century several *Canonists* holding that a General Council can not only licitly declare but also authoritatively judge a heretical Pope.⁵

b) In the 14th and 15th centuries not only Canonists but also many *Theologians* defended the authority of a General Council over the Pope. This teaching was common especially *at the University of Paris* at the time of the Western Schism (1378-1417). At Paris it was defended in addition to others by Henry de Hassia (senior), John Gerson and Peter D'Ailly; and at the University of Heidelberg by Conrad A Gelnhausen. Through the action especially of Cardinal Peter D'Ailly at the *Council of Constance* a declaration was published about the authority of a Council over the Pope (D 1247 with the note). Also in the Councils of *Pisa* (1409) and *Basel* (1431) the doctrine of *Conciliarism* was acknowledged as an axiom.⁶

c) Hence at least from the middle of the 15th century this doctrine about the authority of a General Council over the Pope became a specific element of *Gallicanism*.⁷

597. 3) In the 17th century, besides the *Jansenists* (D 2330), among the adversaries we must mention *Gallicanism*, and also

a) *Rigid Gallicans*, who held that only the authority of a ministerial head of the Church should be conceded to the Roman Pontiff. Thus Richer,

4. V. Gasser, Bishop of Brixen: Msi 52,1226-27; Franzelin, *De traditione* p. 109f.

5. V. Martin, *Comment s'est formée la doctrine de la supériorité du Concile sur le Pape*: RevScRel 17 (1937) 121-43, 261-89, 405-27; Id., *Les origines du Gallicanisme* (1939). Theologians concede that a general Council can licitly declare a Pope heretical, if this case is possible, but not to depose him authoritatively since he is superior to the Council, unless it is clearly certain that he is a doubtful Pope: see Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.6. E. Dublanchy, DTC 7,1714.

6. See De Guibert, n.300; Dorsch, p.347f.; M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* 112-117; P. Ballerini, *De potest. Sum. Pontif. et Conc.*: Mig., *Theol. Cours.* III 1267-1390; H.X. Arquillière, *L'appel au Concile sous Philippe le Bel*: RevQHist 89 (1911) 23-55; J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 215f. See above n.471.

7. V. Martin, *loc.cit.*: RevScRel 17 (1937) 405-427; A.M. Velico, *De Ecclesia* p.26-29.

who then was followed especially by the *Febronians* and the *Synod of Pistoia* (D 2592-2597 “All the more...”; 2603 with the note).

b) *Mild Gallicans*, at the end of the 17th century, who in matters of faith said, “the part of the Roman Pontiff is preeminent, nevertheless his judgment is not unalterable unless the consent of the Church is added” (D 2284). Eminent men also defended this doctrine of the “Articles of the Gallican Clergy,” like Launoy and Bossuet the main author of the articles; the *Synod of Pistoia* also adopted it as its own (D 2699, 2670, 2281).⁸

c) At the time of Vatican Council I several learned men defended the doctrine of the mild Gallicans, such as Döllinger, Langen, Reusch, Maret, Michaud, Schulte, Gladstone, and others, some of whom, surely against the will of Döllinger, founded a new schismatic and heretical sect, called the Old Catholics, since it was formed by those who refused to submit themselves to the new Vatican definition.⁹

598. Schismatic Orientals deny nothing more ardently and vehemently than the infallibility of the Pope, asserting, that by this dogma of the Vatican Council an insurmountable wall of separation between them and Catholics has been constructed by the Roman Church; they also say that the infallibility of the Pope contradicts the essence itself of the Orthodox Church.¹⁰

5) Contemporary *Ecumenists* totally exclude the infallibility of the Pope, because they maintain complete, individual and doctrinal freedom before God alone as a fundamental and firm principle.¹¹

599. Doctrine of the Church. *Vatican Council I* expressly defined this thesis as a dogma of faith, sess.4 ch.4: D 3065-3075. The definitions of other Councils, especially of those “in which the Orient agreed with the West about union,” are cited by the same Vatican I, namely, *Constantinople IV* dealing with the case of Photius: D 3066 and 363-364 with the note; *Lyons II* treating union with the Greeks: D 3067 and 861; *Florence*, which dealt with the union of the Orientals: D 3068 and 1307.

8. C. Constantin, *Declaratio de 1682*: DTC 4,197-201; E. Levesque, *Bossuet*: DHGE 9,1378-12382. See A.G. Martimort, *Le Gallicanisme de Bossuet* (1953).

9. See D'Berbigny, n.206,3; A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* p.45-49.

10. See the Encyclical of the 33 Oriental Bishops in the year 1848: Msi 40,391-395, 399-403.407; Jugie, 4,490; Spáčil: OrCh 2 (1924) 84-86; Zankow, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum* (1928) 138f.; Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 148.

11. *Etudes Oecuméniques du Concile Oecuménique des Eglises: Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu* 4 (1940) 360-364; *Minutes and Reports of the World Council of Churches* (July 1950) 89. On how radically Barth excludes the infallibility of the Pope, see Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* 2 (1951) p.1158 note 2.

Bishop Gasser, the Secretary in the name of the Committee for the Faith, clearly explained the definition of the Vatican in the same Council when he said: "In this definition the Council is treating, 1) the subject of infallibility, which is the Roman Pontiff, precisely as the Pontiff, as a public person in relation to the universal Church; 2) the act is contained, or the quality and condition of the act of the infallible pontifical definition... when he speaks *ex cathedra*, that is (as we have explained) and also the manifest intention of defining something is required... 3) the principle or efficacious cause of infallibility, which is expressed under one proposition, so that it is explained under a twofold notion, one generic and the other specific: *under the generic notion* through the words "in defining doctrine on faith or morals," *under the specific notion* through the words "he possesses the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed the Church to be endowed."¹²

600. We have already briefly explained these four ideas in the definition of terms. In particular, in the Council the Secretary for the Faith extensively treated the object of infallibility and it will be treated by us in the thesis dealing with this matter. For the sake of clarity, it will suffice for now to quote a few things from the explanations of the Secretary. According to him, the intention of the Council was to define, "that infallibility, whether it is viewed in the whole Church Teaching or in the Supreme Pontiff himself, extends to the same area of truths; and so the same things must be believed concerning the object of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, which are believed concerning the object of the infallibility of the Church. Indeed, according to the same Secretary, it is certain that it is a revealed truth that the infallibility of the Church is extended to defining the dogmas of faith; but it is certain that it is at least theologically certain that the infallibility of the Church in defining other truths "which although in themselves are not revealed, nevertheless are required to integrally guard, to properly explain and to efficaciously define the deposit itself of revelation."

Hence in virtue of this definition of the Vatican, entirely the same thing must be held concerning the infallibility of the Pontiff that is held concerning the infallibility of the Church, namely, that it is a *dogma of faith* in defining revealed truths, but that it is only *theologically certain* in defining religious truths that are connected with the deposit of faith.¹³

601. It is clear from the facts that the *Vatican Definition* touches also the *mild Gallicans*. 1) On July 13, 1830 the text of the definition was proposed to the preliminary vote of the Fathers. 601 Fathers were present. They responded: yes, 451; yes with qualifications, 62; no, 88. 2) On July 16 the Archbishop of Paris and the Bishop of Orleans wrote letters to Pius IX, requesting: a) that these words should be expunged: or that he has only the more important parts, but not the total fullness of this supreme power; b) that after the words: "performing the office" these other words should be added: "and relying on the testimony of the Churches." But the Pope through the Sub-Secretary of the Council answered

12. Msi 52,1225.1316.

13. Msi 52,1226f. See Dieckmann, n.765-770; I.B. Franzelin, *De traditione* (1896) p.110.

them on the same day that he was leaving this whole matter to the General Congregation, while reserving the definitive decision to himself. From these words it is obvious that they wanted to free the opinion of the mild Gallicanism from any condemnation. 3) On July 17 the Cardinal Archbishop of Prague sent a letter to Pius IX signed by two Cardinals, 9 Archbishops, 44 Bishops, in which they said they were going to vote No, and they said: lest we give a negative vote in the presence of the Pope, "we have decided to be absent for the vote on July 18," which is what they actually did.¹⁴

In spite of this, on July 18, 1870 the Fourth session of the Council took place. There were 535 Fathers present, of whom 533 answered Yes, and 2 answered No. Therefore the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff was defined with a truly moral unanimity, even contrary to the requests of those who tried to salvage a *mild Gallicanism*. But those 55 Fathers who signed the letter on July 17, afterwards in writing expressed their explicit assent and submission to the Roman Pontiff.¹⁵

602. Theological note. The thesis is a matter of *defined divine faith* (*de fide divina definita*).

603. Proof 1) As a conclusion of the preceding thesis, for since it has been proved, now we can argue from it in a methodical manner. From the preceding thesis we know that an Ecumenical Council is infallible when it proposes something with a solemn judgment as a dogma of faith that must be held by all. But Vatican Council I with a solemn judgment proposes our thesis as a dogma that must be held by all. Therefore our thesis is infallibly true.

604. It is proved 2) By the argument that the Vatican indicates with these words: "In this apostolic primacy... the supreme power of teaching is also included" (D 3065).

a) *In general* from Matt. 16:18f.; John 21:15-17. The Roman Pontiff as the Foundation, as the Key Bearer, as the universal Pastor, by the will of Christ obtains supreme power in the Church. Therefore he must obtain in a supreme grade whatever power there is in the Church; for otherwise his power would not be supreme. But the supreme grade of doctrinal power, which is in the Church, is infallibility. Therefore the Roman Pontiff, as the Foundation, as the Key Bearer, as the universal Pastor obtains infallibility in the Church. *The minor* was proved in thesis 12. Therefore the conclusion is clear.

605. b) *In particular* from Matt. 16:18. The Roman Pontiff, by reason of the Primacy, is the efficacious principle of unity and firmness in the

14. Msi 52,1243.1321-28, 1334-35. Th. Granderath, *Constit. Dogmat. Conc. Vatic.* P.164.

15. Msi 52,1334f.; 53,935.

Church, a society that is essentially doctrinal. But the efficacious principle of unity and firmness in a society essentially doctrinal must be infallible. Therefore the Roman Pontiff by reason of the Primacy, that is, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, is infallible.

The major is clear from the theses on the institution of the Church, the Primacy and the Magisterium.

The minor is certain from an analysis of it alone: because if the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks *ex cathedra*, could err, then when he is in error either the whole Church would agree with him or not; if the first, the Church would not be firm in the truth, or he would not be its efficacious principle of firmness; if the second, the Church would be separated from its foundation and head, which therefore would not be its efficacious principle of unity; but this is clearly opposed to the promise of Christ.

606. c) *In particular* from Matt. 16:19. The Roman Pontiff, by reason of the Primacy, in the Church as a society essentially doctrinal, has the supreme office of binding and loosing all things, therefore also in doctrine, and so his acts are ratified by God in heaven. But the supreme office of deciding doctrinal matters, whose acts are ratified by God in heaven, cannot not be infallible. Therefore the Roman Pontiff, by reason of the Primacy, or when he speaks *ex cathedra*, is infallible.

The minor is certain, because if he could fall into error, then God himself would have to be thought to ratify it, which is absolutely repugnant.

607. It is proved 3) By the argument that the Vatican presents, that is, from the promise of Christ in Luke 22:32: D 3069-3070, although it is certain that the Council did not intend “to declare authentically” the meaning of this text.”¹⁶

In Luke 22:32 the reference is to the primatial prerogative instituted in Peter. For, from the context it is apparent:

a) Luke 22:24, that the Apostles then were disputing in an enquiring way about who among them was *greater*;

b) Luke 22:2-28, that Christ warned them, that authority in the Church should not be ambitioned, but exercised with humility. However, he does suppose that among them someone is greater, because he says: *he who is greater among you* and *he who is leader*, and he gives them the example of himself in how to exercise supreme power.

c) Luke 22:29-30, that Christ promised the Apostles outstanding preeminence in

16. See the interpretation of the ecclesiastical Magisterium of this place: D 732, and especially Leo XIII: ASS 28,728. That the Council did not intend authentically to interpret Luke 22:32, see note 17; J. Lainez, *Disputationes tridentinae* I p.99 n.73.

his heavenly Kingdom, in the hope and comparison with which all earthly power is to be considered quite small.

d) Luke 22:31f., that Christ committed the prerogative to Peter alone of strengthening his brothers in the faith; in order to obtain this, in virtue of Christ's prayer, the promise is made to Peter that his faith would never fail.

608. Accordingly we argue: In virtue of his prayer, Christ promised to Peter alone indefectibility in faith so that Peter can strengthen his brothers. But such a promise: a) is absolute and efficacious; b) implies infallibility; c) is made to Peter as the supreme Head of the Church. Therefore in Luke 22:31f. Christ promises infallibility to the supreme Head of the Church.

The major from the exposition of the text made above.

The minor a) is an absolute and efficacious promise, because it is not tied to any condition and because it is proclaimed as being joined with the effect.

b) It implies infallibility, because absolute indefectibility in faith, and a simply efficacious power of confirming the brothers cannot be understood unless infallibility is supposed.

c) The promise is made to Peter as the supreme Head of the Church, therefore forever and not just during the time of Christ's passion; because it is made to the one who, among the Apostles, is assumed to be "greater and the leader" in order to strengthen the Apostles themselves, and because from the parallelism between Luke 22:31-32 and Matt. 16:18 it is confirmed that in Luke he is dealing with the part of the supreme office, which Christ had promised to Peter in Matthew. For, in both places, what is shown is the same danger, the same principal power of Christ, the same vicarious power of Peter, finally, the same effect or victory over the danger:

Matt. 16:18

Luke 22:31-32

The same danger

"The gates of hell"

"Satan seeks to sift you"

The same principal power of Christ

"And I tell you"

"I have prayed for you"

The same vicarious power of Peter

"Because you are Peter"

"That your faith may not fail"

An equal followed effect

"On this rock I will
build my Church"

"And when you have turned
again strengthen your brethren"

From this comparison it is clear that the affirmation in Luke 22:31f. concerns the part of the supreme office, or the strengthening of the faithful in the faith, which in the total and perennial supreme office, or in the

fundamental office of the whole Church is contained in Matt. 16:18.¹⁷

609. It is proved 4) By the argument that the Vatican Council indicates with these words: "This Holy See has always held, the perpetual custom of the Church proves, and the Ecumenical Councils of the Church have declared."

A. **In general**, this argument can be reduced to this. In the whole history of the Church and of ecclesiastical literature the Roman See, as the primatial See of St. Peter, and in it the Supreme Pontiff, as the successor of Peter, appears evidently recognized:

- a) as the center of unity in faith and as the criterion of faith;
- b) as the supreme and ultimate tribunal of appeals in matters of dogma;
- c) as the highest source of definitive and irrevocable decisions;
- d) as the supreme authority of absolutions from accusations also in doctrine;

e) as the necessary and definitive confirmation of the Ecumenical Councils themselves. But these points, which can be easily proved from the doctrinal decisions of the Supreme Pontiffs of all times, manifestly show that the Roman Pontiff has always been acknowledged as the crown or summit of the doctrinal authority of the infallible Church, which surely necessarily implies that the infallibility of the Pontiff himself was recognized.¹⁸

610. B. In particular, according to the Vatican, the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff 1) "This Holy See has always held": D 3065.

Julius I, in 341: "This was the custom: that first you write to us and thus what is just is determined from here": D 132.

Damasus I, in 372: Against the Armenian Synod of 400 Bishops he writes: "The opinion of the Roman Bishop is to be sought before all others": ML 13,349.

611. Anastasius I, about 400, extolling the orthodoxy of the Fathers and especially that of Pope Liberius against the Arians: "Italy retained intact the faith which was handed down by the Apostles... and reigned as victor over the whole world": D 209.

Innocent I, about 417, to the African Bishops: "The Fathers made their decisions

17. See Knabenbauer, on Luke 22:31f.; D'Herbigny, n.183. To one Father asking "that the words of Christ: *I have prayed for you...etc.*, should be authentically explained by the Council," the Secretary, Bishop Gasser, responded: "An authentic declaration of this kind could not be intended, and if it had been intended, certainly also a debate on this matter would have to have been held in the Council" (Msi 52,1222).

18. This argument is more fully developed by Palmieri, th.25,2, and Straub, n.978-97. It is treated accurately in Lercher, n.488-91. The things that follow under B can be said to be an explanation of the same general argument.

not by human, but by divine judgment, so that they thought that nothing whatever, although it concerned separated and remote provinces, should be concluded unless it first came to the attention of this See, so that what was a just proclamation might be confirmed by the total authority of this See": D 217.

Zosimus, in 418, to the African Bishops: "Although, therefore, Peter is the source of such great authority... you must know that we govern in his place and also hold our office by virtue of his name... although such great authority belongs to Us that no one could argue again with Our decision": D 221.

Boniface I, in 422: "... We have directed to the synod [*of Corinth*]... such writings that all the brethren may know... that there is to be no review of our judgment. In fact, it has never been licit to deliberate again on that which has once been decided by the Apostolic See": D 232.

Simplicius, in 476, to the Emperor: "This same norm of apostolic doctrine endures in the successors of him upon whom the Lord imposed the care of the whole sheepfold, whom [he promised] he would not fail even to the end of the world, against whom he promised that the gates of hell would never prevail, by whose judgment he testified that what was bound on earth could not be loosed in heaven": D 160 [34th ed.].

Gelasius I, in 495: "Also the epistle of blessed Pope Leo addressed to Flavian... if anyone argues concerning the text of this one even in regard to one iota, and does not receive it in all (parts) reverently, let him be anathema": D 353.

612. Hormisdas, in 517: "The beginning of salvation is to guard the rule of the right faith and to deviate in no way from the determination of the Fathers. And because one cannot ignore the words of our Lord Jesus Christ when he said, 'You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church'... for in the Apostolic See the faith has always been preserved immaculate... in which there is the integral and true and perfect solidity of the Christian religion" (D 363-364).

Pelagius II, in 585: "You know that the Lord proclaims in the Gospel: *Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I have asked the Father for thee, that thy faith fail not; and thou being once converted, confirm thy brethren.* Consider, most dear ones, that the Truth could not have lied, nor will the faith of Peter be able to be shaken or changed forever": D 246 [34th ed.], where besides Luke 22:31f., also John 21:15-17 and Matt 16:18f. are cited as confirmation of the same thing.

Nicolaus I, in 865, to Emperor Michael: "The first See will not be judged by anyone... where there is a greater authority, the judgment of inferiors must be brought to it to be annulled or to be substantiated; certainly it is evident that the judgment of the Apostolic See, of whose authority there is none greater, is to be refused by no one" (D 638-640).

613. Leo IX, in 1053, to Michael Cerularius: "The holy Church built upon a rock, that is Christ, and upon Peter or Cephas... because the gates of hell, that is, by the disputations of heretics which lead the vain to destruction, it would never be overcome; thus Truth itself promises, through whom are true, whatsoever things are true: *The gates of*

hell will not prevail against it. The same Son declares that he obtained the effect of this promise from the Father by prayers, by saying to Peter: *Simon, behold Satan etc.* Therefore, will there be anyone so foolish as to dare to regard his prayer as in any way vain whose being willing is being able? By the See of the chief of the Apostles, namely by the Roman Church, through the same Peter, as well as through his successors, have not the comments of all the heretics been disproved, rejected and overcome, and the hearts of the brethren in the faith of Peter which so far neither has failed, nor up to the end will fail, been strengthened?": D 351 [34th ed.].

614. Innocent II, in 1140: "We, therefore, although unworthy, who are seen to occupy the Chair of St. Peter, to whom was said by the Lord, 'And when you have repented, strengthen your brothers'... after having taken counsel with our brethren the principal Bishops, have condemned by the authority of the sacred canons the chapters sent to us by your discretion and all the teaching of this Peter [Abelard] with their author, and we have imposed upon him as a heretic perpetual silence": D 387 [34th ed.].

Clement VI, in 1351, to Mekhithar, Catholicos of the Armenians: "Whether you have believed and still believe that, when doubts arise about the Catholic faith, the Roman Pontiff alone is able to put an end (to them) by an authentic decision that must be adhered to inviolably; and what he himself determines to be true, by virtue of the authority of the keys handed over to him by Christ, is true and Catholic, and what he determines to be false and heretical must be considered as such" (D 1064).

615. There are innumerable testimonies of later Roman Pontiffs. CIC cn.1323 § 1 manifests their mind and that of the Holy See: "All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed." To this principle, which was borrowed from Vatican I (D 3011), the CIC added § 2: "It is proper both to an Ecumenical Council and to the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra* to pronounce a solemn judgment of this kind."

From these statements which we have quoted it is sufficiently certain that the Holy See has always held the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff.¹⁹

616. 2) The perpetual practice of the Church proves the same infallibility (D 3065).

a.) Theoretically.

St. Ignatius Martyr, ca. 107, *to the Romans* 3,1: "you have never envied anyone, you have taught others. But I want those things also to be firm,

19. What we will present later under 2,b can be used to prove the same thing.

which you teach and command”: R 53. The disciple and successor of the Apostles in the Apostolic Church of Antioch acknowledges these things.

St. Irenaeus, ca. 190, *adv. Haer.* 3,3,2: [we do this, I say] by indicating that tradition derived from the Apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Pau; as also [by pointing out] the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the succession of the Bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its pre-eminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the apostolic tradition has been preserved continuously by those [faithful men] who exist everywhere.” *Ibid.* 3.4.1: “Since therefore we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the Church; since the Apostles, like a rich man [depositing his money] in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth”: R 210, 213 (see above n.410f.).

617. Tertullian, ca. 200, *de praescript.* 22: “They are wont to say that the Apostles did not know everything,... subjecting Christ to rebuke, because he sent the Apostles less instructed or too simple. Who therefore, being of sound mind, can believe that they did not know something, whom the Lord gave us as Teachers...? Was something hidden from Peter, called the rock on which the Church is built—the one who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth?”²⁰

Note that the reason why Tertullian is moved to acknowledge such doctrinal authority in Peter is the office of the Primacy. Therefore he interprets the conflict with Paul (Gal. 2:11) in the same place, n.23: “If Peter was reproved... surely this was a fault in his conversation, not in his preaching”: R 294. And in the same place, n.36, he says: “If you are near Italy, you have Rome, where we also have an authority close at hand. What a happy Church that is! On which the Apostles poured out all their doctrine, with their blood: where Peter had a like Passion with the Lord; where Paul has for his own crown the same death with John; where the Apostle John was plunged into boiling oil, and suffered nothing, and was afterwards banished to an island”: R 297.

St. Cyprian, in 252, to Pope Cornelius: “They [heretics] dare to travel to the Chair of Peter and to the principal Church, from which priestly unity takes its origin... and they do not think they are Romans, whose faith was praised by the Apostles and whom faithlessness has never touched”: R 580.

618. St. Jerome, ca.376, to Pope Damasus: “I thought that I should consult the Chair of Peter and the faith praised by the Apostle... As I follow no leader save Christ, so I communicate with none but your blessedness, that is with the Chair of Peter. For this, I know, is the rock on which the Church is built!... Whoever eats the lamb outside this house is profane... Whoever does not gather with you, scatters”: R 1346; ML

20. ML 2,34; Kch 1941.

22,355f. The same St. Jerome bears witness to the practice of the universal Church of recurring to the Holy See in order to gain confirmation of synods; for, in his letter 123, ca. 406, he wrote: "Several years ago, when in ecclesiastical matters I was helping Damasus, the Bishop of the City of Rome, I responded to the consultations sent in by Eastern and Western synods."²¹

Prudentius, ca. 370: "Give, O Christ, to your Romans,—That the City may be Christian:—Through it you have given—that the one mind of holy things may come to others.—Let all things be united—Hence the members are a symbol." "May the one faith thrive, which was established in the old temple,—Which Paul preserves and also the Chair of Peter."²²

Bacharius, ca.400: Of the many heresies that plagued Rome, "not one of them could touch or move the Chair of Peter, that is, *the Chair of faith*": ML 20, 1023.

St. Augustine, in 417, *Serm.* 131,10,10: "On this matter [of the Pelagians] two Councils were sent to the Apostolic See: from there also the rescripts came. *The case is closed*: Would that at some time error also would be terminated!": R 1507. Again, in 420, *Contra duas epist. Pelagianorum*, 2,3,5: "By the letter concerning this matter, of Pope Innocent, of blessed memory, *all doubt was removed*": R 1892.

619. St. Cyril of Alexandria, in 429, to Celestine I concerning the case of Nestorius: "But since God desires vigilance from us in these matters and the ancient custom of the Churches that matters of this kind be communicated to your Holiness, I am writing... However, it is necessary that the judgment of your Holiness in this case be made known both to the Bishops of Macedonia and to all the Bishops in the Orient."²³

St. Peter Chrysologus, ca. 449, *epist. ad Eutichem*: "In all things we exhort you, honorable brother, that you give obedience to the things which have been written by the most Blessed Pope of the city of Rome; because Blessed Peter, who lives and resided in his own See, is offering the truth of the faith to those seeking it. For we, in our desire for peace and faith, cannot listen to explanations of the faith outside of the approval of the Bishop of the city of Rome": R 2178.

Theodoretus Cyrensis, in 449, to Leo I: "We pay respect to Your Apostolic See, that we may receive from you a remedy for the wounds of the Churches. For it belongs to you to have the Primacy in all things (Διὰ πάντα γάρ ὑμῶν τό πρωτεύειν ἀρμόττει)... I am waiting for a judgment from Your Apostolic See, and I ask and implore Your Holiness that he may bring help to me asking for an upright and just tribunal, and that he may order me to come to You, and to show my teaching which is based on the Apostolic testimonies... But above all, that I may be taught by You, and I ask whether or not it is necessary for me to be satisfied in this unjust situation; I am waiting for your decision": ML 54,847.851.

21. CSEL 56 p.82: ML 22,1052.

22. Hymn 2 v.433-38: Hymnus 11 v.30-31: ML 60,322-535; see Z. García-Villada, *Historia eclesiástica de España* 1.1. p.221.

23. St. Cyril: MG 77,79.86.

620. b) Practically, “*The practice of the Church confirms that the supreme power of teaching is included in this Primacy*”: D 3065.

In the question about Montanism, flourishing about 178 in Pontus and Asia, when the Church in Lyons appealed to Pope Eleutherius to provide a remedy; his successor, Victor I, in an authoritative manner condemned the Montanists, as is inferred from the testimony of Tertullian: Kch 218. Therefore they acknowledge that it pertains to the Pope to repair damage to the faith that happens in any Church.

In the dispute over the re-baptism of heretics, ca. 257, when Pope Stephen made an authoritative decision against the judgment of five Councils, four held in Carthage and one in Cappadocia, and against the opinion of St. Cyril himself, that a Baptism correctly conferred in heresy or by heretics must not be repeated, saying: “Let nothing be introduced except what is already handed down”: D 110.

621. *In the Arian heresy*, 325-381, when the Roman Pontiffs from Sylvester I to Damasus I defend the correct faith of the Council of Nicaea I, and condemn the factions of Arians and Semi-Arians even when they enjoy the favor the Emperor.²⁴

In the case of the Priscillianists, 380-447, from Damasus I to Leo I, the Roman Pontiffs establish the conditions for the condemnation or absolution of the Priscillianists, and they decide definitively on matters of doctrine as the supreme judges of the faith.²⁵

622. *In the Acacian disagreement*, 476-550, Pope Simplicius in the year 476 warns Accacius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, to be on his guard against Monophysitism and that he embrace the Creed of Chalcedon (D 343). Felix III, the immediate successor of Simplicius, excommunicates Acacius in 483, when he refuses to submit himself to the Pope, so this was the beginning of the so-called Acacian schism (484-519). Pope Hormisdas, in 517, proposes to the Acacians the rule of faith to be professed and in it the supreme doctrinal authority of the Roman Pontiff is clearly expressed: D 363-365. The formula of Hormisdas was signed by the Emperor Justinian I, the three Patriarchs of Constantinople who succeeded Acacius, namely, John II (518-520), Epiphanius (520-536) and Menna (536-552), and also about 2,000 other bishops. Afterwards both the Latin and the Greek Fathers in the Council of Constantinople IV (870) embraced the same rule of faith of Hormisdas. Hence the supreme

24. See what we say in thesis 9, n.421f.

25. See what we say in thesis 9, n.424f.

doctrinal authority of the Roman Pontiff in a practical way is manifestly apparent from the practice of the Church.²⁶

623. c) In a practiced manner the use of the Church formally proves the same thing, namely, with the exercise of infallibility in the Decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, which from the matter, form, end and circumstances it is certain that they are infallible definitions. Silva-Tarouca, who completed accurate historical investigations on this matter, thinks that at least 20 true *definitions ex cathedra* of the Roman Pontiffs, from the time of Damasus in 380 up to the time of Hadrian II in 870, that is, before the beginning of the Photian schism, were proclaimed and he attempts to demonstrate their historical truth.²⁷

624. 1. The *Tomus Damasi*, in 380, in which the heresies of Arius, Eunomius, the Macedonians, Photinus, Apollinaris are condemned, but the Catholic dogma is defined that is opposed to each of these heretics: D 152-177.

2. The *Tractoria Zosimus* to the bishops of the whole world written in 418, whereby the heresy of Pelagius is condemned, but the Catholic dogma on grace is defined. Only fragments have survived of this letter, a true Encyclical: D 231, 243f.

3. *The definition of Celestine*, by which in the Roman synod of 430 the heresy of Nestorius was condemned and a judgment was made, which then the synod of Ephesus in 431 embraces and commands to be accepted.²⁸

625. 4. *The condemnation by Leo I* of the errors of the Priscillianists in 447, by the letter sent to Turibius, the Bishop of Asturia: ML 54,677.

5. *The definition of Leo I* of the dogma of the two natures and one person in Christ, and the condemnation of the contrary heresy of Eutyches, in his letter to Flavianus in 449; then in 451 the synod of Chalcedon embraced this definition: ML 54,755.

6. *The condemnation by Leo I* of Nestorianism and Eutychianism in his letter to the Emperor Leo I in 458, in which he defines the true dogma about Christ: ML 54,1155.

7. The dogmatic letter of *Pope Gelasius I* (492-496) against mitigated Monophysitism, or "the treatise against Eutyches and Nestorius."²⁹

8. *The profession of Christological faith of Gelasius I*, in which he teaches the Bishops of Illyricum "under what kind of faith one must live": CSEL 35, n.81.

9. *The rule of faith*, which in 517 Pope *Hormisdas* commanded the Orientals to

26. Hergenroether-Carmona, *Historia de la Iglesia* 2 n.155-63; K. Kirsch, *Leitfaden der Kirchengeschichte* 1, Das christliche Altertum (1923) 141f.

27. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Institutines Historiae Ecclesiasticae in unum auditorum* (Pontificiae Universitatis Gregoriana): Part 2, *Ecclesia in Imperio Romano-Byzantino* (IV to XI centuries) fasc. 1 (Rome 1933) 86-190. We present these 20 decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs as true infallible definitions relying only on the authority of P. Silva-Tarouca. See J. Salaverri, *Valor de las Enciclicas a la luz de la "Humani generis"*: MiscCom 17 (1951) 135-172.

28. Only fragments of this decree have survived in Arnobius, *Conflictus* 2,13: ML 53,289; Kch 790.

29. A text of this kind is desired in Migne; but it is found in Thiel, *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum* 1,543.

sign: D 363-365.

10. The letter of *Pope Hormisdas* to Emperor Justinian, in 521, in which the properties of the three divine Persons and of the person and substance in Christ our Lord are defined: CSEL 35, n.236.

627. 11. *The Christological formula of faith of Pope Agapitus* sent to the Emperor Justinian and Menna the Patriarch, and signed by them in 536: CSEL 35, n.89f.

12. *Pope Agapitus* solemnly approves the formula of faith made public by Emperor Justinian and he excommunicates all those opposing it in 536: CSEL 35, n.91.

13. "Constitution on the three Chapters" of *Pope Vigilius* in 553: CSEL 35, n.83.

14. *Profession of faith of Pope Pelagius I* to Childebertus, King of the Franks: ML 69,408-410.

15. *Profession of faith of Pope Pelagius I* sent in 591 to the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem.³⁰

628. 17. *The Encyclical of Pope Martin I "Catholicae Ecclesiae universae,"* in which he promulgates the decrees of the Lateran synod in the year 649; by these decrees all the heresies, and especially Monotheletism are condemned, and the Ecthesis [Edict] of Heraclius and the Typus of the Emperor Constans II are rejected.³¹

18. *The dogmatic letter of Pope Agatho* to the Emperor Constantine Pogonaturm in 680, in which he proposes a formula of faith, condemns the error of the Monothelites, and defines the Catholic faith. This definition of the Pope was faithfully received by the Council of Constantinople III in 680-681: D 548f.

629. 19. *The definition on the veneration of sacred images*, cn. 6, of *Pope Nicolas I* in the Roman synod of 863: ML 119,855.

20. *The formula of faith proposed by Pope Hadrian II* to be signed by all the Bishops in the Council of Constantinople IV in the year 870, in which all the heretics, especially the iconoclasts and Photius are condemned: ML 129,36.

With these definitions, in practice and formally the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is shown to be proved by the use of the Church.

630. 3) **The Ecumenical Councils themselves have declared that infallibility is included in the Apostolic Primacy:** D 3056.

The Council of Ephesus, in 431, after it received the definition of *Celestine*, also gave its assent to the Legate of the Roman Pontiff who said:

"Indeed no one doubts, in fact it is obvious to all ages, that the holy and most blessed Peter, prince and head of all the Apostles, the pillar of faith and the foundation of the Catholic Church, received the keys of the kingdom from our Lord Jesus Christ... received the keys of the kingdom... and even to this time and forever lives and governs

30. ML 77,478; see ML 77,1327-29.

31. D 501-522: ML 87,119; Kch 1070.1080.

and exercises judgment in his successors”: D 3065.

631. *The Council of Chalcedon*, in 451, received the dogmatic letter of *Leo I* to *Flavius*, in which the doctrine of faith on the Incarnation of the Word was defined, so that after the reading of the letter the Fathers of the Council did not hesitate to exclaim:

“This is the faith of the Fathers, this is the faith of the Apostles. All of us believe this; the Orthodox believe this; anathema to anyone who does not believe this: *Peter has spoken through Leo*” (see D 293). But afterwards in the letter to *Leo I*, about 520 Bishops gathered together in the Council said: “And you were their leader, as the head is (the leader) of the limbs, making known your excellent advice in the person of those who represented you”: D 306.³²

632. *The Council of Constantinople III*, in 680, “faithfully accepts and welcomes with open hands” (D 553) the dogmatic letter of Pope *Agatho*, in which the doctrine on the two wills in Christ is defined; it fully declared further:

“The highest chief of the Apostles struggled with us; for we had his imitator and the successor to the See as a supporter and illustrator of the divine sacrament through a letter. That ancient city of Rome offered you [Constantinus] a confession written by God... and *Peter has spoken through Agatho*”: D 548. Furthermore, this same Council in practice acknowledged the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, which was openly taught in the same letter with these words: “Relying on the assistance of the Redeemer, this Apostolic Church of his has never turned aside from the way of truth in any question whatsoever of error”: ML 87,1168.

633. *The Council of Constantinople IV*, in 870, in which the errors of *Photius* were condemned, accepted the formula of faith proposed by *Hadrian II*, which agrees with the Rule of faith of Pope *Hormisdas* and teaches the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff: D 363-365, 3066. The Emperor *Basil* said to Legates of the Roman Pontiff:

“Through my legates I come to the Apostolic See as the teacher of ecclesiastical affairs and therefore I have waited upon your presence, so that our Church by your decree and wisdom may receive a remedy of health and we will obey not our inclinations but your judgment.”³³

634. *Lateran Council IV*, in 1215, declares: “The Roman Church, through the Lord’s disposition, has a primacy of ordinary power over all other Churches inasmuch as she is the mother and teacher of all Christ’s faithful”: D 807-808, 811.

32. Pius XII, Encyclical “*Sempiternus Rex*”: AAS 43 (1951) 631-33; Msi 6,971 and 6,155.

33. Silva-Tarouca, *loc.cit.*, 55-59.

The Council of Lyons II, in 1274, in which also she is called “the most holy Roman Church, mother and *teacher* of all the faithful,” further in the profession of faith proposed to the Greeks for union, openly includes the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff: D 850, 861, 3067.

635. *The Council of Florence*, in 1439, while treating the union of the Orientals, clearly defined this same doctrine, saying: “the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter and the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and *teacher* of all Christians”: D 1307, 3068.

The Council of Trent, in 1564, although it did not deal explicitly with the Primacy and infallibility of the Roman Pontiff, however without doubt it did presuppose the recognition of the Primacy in its whole way of acting, and it did at least implicitly assert that infallibility in sessions 7, 14 and 22, and also in the Tridentine profession of faith, when it imposed this profession: “I acknowledge that the Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church is the mother and *teacher* of all the Churches”: D 1616, 1697-1700, 1749, 1868.³⁴

636. Scholium 1. Is there one subject of infallibility or two? The question is about the *immediate* subject of *active* infallibility in defining matters of faith and morals. Among the authors this question is controversial.

1. *In this matter three things must be held* as absolutely certain: 1) The Roman Pontiff, as the public person of the supreme Pastor and Teacher of the whole Church, is infallible; 2) the Bishops, as the College of the whole teaching Church, under the Roman Pontiff agreeing in proposing a doctrine to be held and believed by all, are infallible; 3) the College of Bishops, as a subject of infallibility, is not adequately distinct from the Roman Pontiff, because in order to be such a College, necessarily and essentially it must include its head, which from the institution of Christ is the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy. We have demonstrated these three points in the preceding theses.

637. 2. The disputed question is this: Whether the College of Bishops with the Pope and under the Pope on the one hand, and on the other hand the Pope himself as a public person—are they two immediate subjects of infallibility inadequately distinct; or is the immediate subject of all infallibility of the Church the Roman Pontiff alone, through whose mediation infallibility is derived to the body of Bishops as coming from the head to the members?

638. 3. Opinions of the authors: 1) *These hold that there is one immediate subject of infallibility*, the Roman Pontiff: Palmieri, Billot, Straub, Wilmers, De Groot, Muncu-

34. See Alonso-Bárcena, *El Primado Romano en el Concilio de Trento*: RazFe *El Concilio de Trento* (1945) 397-428.

nill, Michelitsch, Zapelena, Lercher, Dublancy, and many others. 2) *These defend the view that there are two immediate subjects of infallibility inadequately distinct*: Cercia, Pesch, Mazzella, Kleutgen, Franzelin, Schneeman, Hurter, Scheeben, Spacil, Bainvel, Dorsch, De Guibert, Maroto, Stolz, Zubizarreta, Ruffino, and many others. 3) The following do not take a position: D'Herbigny, Schultes, Felder, De San, Van Laak, Van Noort, Vellico, Dieckmann; however, the latter author says that he leans more to the opinion of one subject of infallibility.³⁵

639. 4. *In Vatican Council I* both opinions were freely defended. For, the Secretary for the faith, Bishop Gasser, in the General Congregation on July 11, 1870, said: "The decrees on the faith published by the General Council are not infallible unless they have been confirmed by the Pope. The reason for this matter is not that which, and I say this with sorrow, has been declared from this pulpit, namely, as if all infallibility of the Church is situated in the Pope alone and is derived from the Pope in the Church and communicated to her... But how could infallibility be communicated? This I do not understand." Hence Gasser held for the twofold subject of infallibility (see Msi 52,1216).

In the same Vatican Council, in the General Congregation on July 16, that is, two days before the first dogmatic Constitution on the Church was promulgated in the solemn fourth session, the other Secretary for the faith, Bishop Zinelli, after mention of the twofold opinion of the authors concerning the subject of infallibility, and in the name of the Committee for the faith, declared: "This is not the place to proclaim anything completely determined about this matter, but it must be openly stated... that in no way has a decision been made about this question, nor can an anathema be applied to those who hold either one of these opinions" (Msi 52,1314).

640. 5. Therefore both opinions, even after the Vatican Council, can be freely maintained. In my view the opinion holding that there is one subject of infallibility can be defended better with *speculative arguments*, but the *positive arguments* favor rather the opinion about the twofold subject of infallibility.

Those who hold that there is only one subject of infallibility, say that the absolute firm faith from Christ can be predicated of Peter alone, and therefore that the decrees of a Council obtain their absolute value only from the confirmation of the successor of Peter. However, speculating further on the nature on the unique supreme power on earth of the Vicar of Christ, and stressing the meaning of the metaphors of the rock, of the key bearer, of the pastor of all and of the one who confirms his brothers, they conclude probably that this supreme office in the Church by its very nature demands that *only through his mediation* can infallibility itself be attributed to others (see Matt. 16:18; John 21:15; Luke 22:32).³⁶

35. See Dieckmann, n.743f.; Granderath, *Constitutiones dogmaticae Conc. Vaticani* 188-90; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1921) 612-624; Maroto, *Instit. Iur. Can.* n.349; G. Ruffino, *Gli organi della infallibilità*: Salesianum 16 (1954) 39-76.

36. Palmieri, th.26; Straub, n.1060; Lercher, th.51; Dublanchy: DTC 7,1697; Zapelena: Greg 10 (1929) 300-305.

641. *Those who defend the twofold subject of infallibility inadequately distinct*, first of all urge that there is a twofold promise of infallibility made directly and immediately by Christ—one to the person of Peter, but the other to the moral person of the College of Apostles.³⁷ Hence they conclude that one must hold that both promises obtain their effect with equal immediacy, lest the meaning of Christ's words to the Apostles might seem to be weakened. Furthermore, they argue that the opinion of the twofold subject of infallibility is more in harmony with the sense of the Church and of the traditional way of conceiving this matter, as the history of the Ecumenical Councils daily makes more clear. Finally, the Orientals, erring in good faith, are opposed to the opinion of one subject of infallibility and especially turned away from the desired union with Catholics, since this view is not easily reconciled with the historical facts, nor does it explain sufficiently why the Bishops in an Ecumenical Council are said to be not mere counselors, but true judges of the faith.³⁸

642. 6. On the supposition of the twofold promise of Christ, infallibility as such depends totally on the divine assistance. But the assistance of God seems to touch in an equally immediate way both the Pope speaking *ex cathedra* and the Council agreeing with the Pope in defining some dogma. Therefore, given the twofold promise, it is easy *also to admit a twofold subject of infallibility inadequately distinct*.³⁹ Therefore, by reason of the immediacy of the assistance of God, the infallibility of the Pope and the infallibility of the teaching Church must be said to be the same thing, as it seems will be made clear from the following analysis, when we have considered the *act, cause, assistance* and *meaning* of the infallible definition of both subjects.

643. An act of pontifical infallibility is a solemn judgment of the person of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*. The *cause* of this infallibility is the assistance of God, who by his providence brings it about that the Supreme Pontiff correctly conceives and aptly expresses the truth of faith or morals which he defines *ex cathedra*. Therefore, the *assistance* of God must touch immediately the person alone of the Pope and terminate in his act alone of judging *ex cathedra*. The *meaning*, therefore, of a doctrine so defined must be drawn from the words used by the Pope and the intention had by the Pope himself in making the definition.

37. The promise to Peter: Matt. 16:18f.; Luke 22:32; the promise to the College of Apostles: Matt. 18:18; 28:18-20; Mark 16:18; John 14:16.17.26; 20:21; see Matt. 10:40; Luke 10:16.

38. Franzelin, *De Traditione* (1896) 109; Pesch, *Institutiones* 1 n.459; Dorsch, 387; Stolz, *De Ecclesia* (1939) 43; see Goemans in *RevScPhTh* 31 (1947) 273; G. Ruffino, *loc.cit.*, note 35.

39. The Secretary Bishop Zinelli, in the name of the Committee for the faith, at *Vatican Council I*, from the twofold immediate promise of Christ—one to the College with its Head and the other made to Peter alone—concluded in general that in the Church there is a twofold subject of supreme authority, saying: "We admit that full and supreme power truly exists in the Supreme Pontiff as the Head, and that the same full and supreme power truly is also in the Head joined together with the members, that is, in the Pontiff with the Bishops." And further, because these two subjects of supreme power are not adequately distinguished from each other, because the Bishops in no way can obtain the supreme power without the Head, he rightly concludes that there cannot be any conflict between the two subjects (Msi 52,1109-10); Grandérath, *Constit. Dogmat. Conc. Vaticani*, 223f. note 1. In the Vatican Council J. Kleutgen held the same thing: Msi 53,321f.325. See CIC 218, 228 [1917].

644. An act of Conciliar infallibility is the consensus of the members of the body joined together and with the Head in a solemn judgment by which they define a doctrine. The act of consensus as such essentially requires that its subject consists of various physical persons, namely, the Pope and the Bishops. The cause of this infallibility is the assistance of God, who by his providence brings it about that the Bishops agree with each other and with the Pope in rightly conceiving and aptly expressing the truth of faith or morals that they define in a conciliar way. Therefore, the assistance of God must touch immediately both the Pope and the Bishops who agree in judging, and it terminates in their solemn judgment; although it is in different ways, according as the terminus demands in which the assistance is received; for, the assistance terminates immediately both in the Pope as the Head and in the Bishops as members of the body, because in agreeing on the definition both the Pope as Head and the Bishops as members, as true judges, have their own proper act. The meaning, therefore, of a doctrine defined by a Council must be deduced from the words and intention not only of the Pope, but also of the Bishops, from which their consensus can be discovered concerning the doctrine which they define solemnly.

645. Scholium 2. Is there one or are there two ways in which the Pope exercises infallibility?⁴⁰ In the Constitution on the Catholic faith of *Vatican Council I* there is this definition: "All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed": D 3011.

From this definition of the Vatican it is inferred that the teaching Church or the College of Bishops constituted under the Pope can exercise infallibility in two ways—one extraordinary and the other ordinary: in the extraordinary way, when in an Ecumenical Council it defines something with a solemn judgment; in the ordinary way, when, dispersed throughout the world, the Bishops propose some doctrine to be held absolutely by all the faithful.

646. Now this is the question: In how many ways does the Roman Pontiff exercise his infallibility? 1) It is certain that he exercises infallibility in an extraordinary way or when he defines something *ex cathedra* with a solemn judgment. For, the Code of Canon Law 1323 [1917], after § 1 quotes the definition of the Vatican that we cited in the previous number, and then it adds § 2: "It is proper both to an Ecumenical Council and to the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra* to pronounce a solemn judgment of this kind."

40. Vacant, *Le Magistère ordinaire* (1887); Dublanchy: DTC 7,1705; Bellamy, *La Théologie cathol. Au XIX^e siècle* (1904) 233-242; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* (1905) n.101; Choupin, *Valeur des décisions doctrinales du Saint-Siège* (1928) 15-37; J. Salaverri, *Valor de las Encíclicas a la luz de la "Humani generis"*: Misc-Com 17 (1952) 152-161; where I deal with this question at length; J. Beumer, *Sind päpstliche Enzykliken unfehlbar?*: ThGl 41 (1952) 262-69; B. Brinkmann, *Gibt es unfehlbare Äusserungen des "Magisterium Ordinarium" des Papstes?*: Schol 28 (1953) 202-21; P. Nau, *L'autorité doctrinale des Encycliques*: PensCath (1950) 15,47-63; 16,42-59; (1951) 19.63-84.

647. Therefore there is a further question, whether the Supreme Pontiff exercises his infallibility also *in an ordinary way*, or not? It seems to us that the response to this question must be 2) *in the affirmative*. For, according to Vatican Council I, the Roman Pontiff “possesses the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed”: D 3074. With this judgment the Fathers suppose *the general principle* against the error, which they intend to condemn, of the *Gallicans* who said: “the Pope is inferior to the Church also in questions of faith”: see Msi 49,673; 52,1230. Therefore, according to the Vatican, the Pope in no way is inferior to the Church in his power of teaching. But the Church is endowed with infallibility which she exercises in extraordinary and ordinary ways: D 3011. Therefore it must be conceded to the Roman Pontiff that he exercises his infallibility in these same ways (see Msi 52,1193).

Furthermore, the Supreme Pontiff has in the Church “the complete fullness of this supreme power”; D 3064. Therefore, he must have it *in every way* in which the supreme power is given in the Church. But the supreme power of infallibility is given in the Church in two ways, namely, *extraordinary* and *ordinary*. Therefore, the Supreme Pontiff has the power of infallibility also in the *ordinary* way. For, otherwise it would be necessary to conclude that the supreme power of infallibility, at least in the way in which it is exercised, is more restricted in the Roman Pontiff than it is in the Church; surely this cannot be admitted, since the Supreme Pontiff in the Church has without any limitation “the complete fullness of this supreme power”: D 3064.

648. Moreover, the Roman Pontiff, in order to exercise his infallibility in matters of faith or morals, about which among the authors there is no controversy, it is not required that he use the extraordinary and solemn form, which is proper to a solemn judgment *ex cathedra*; but any other ordinary and common form is for him sufficient; he can use them to teach the whole Church, provided that he expressly states that it is his intention to teach infallibly.⁴¹

The Roman Pontiff uses *this ordinary way of teaching infallibly* when in matters of faith or morals with his ordinary and universal Magisterium he proposes some doctrine that must be believed or held absolutely. One can think that in this way the ancient Roman Creed was proposed infallibly by the Pope.⁴² Therefore, from the certain and manifest intention of obligating all the faithful to an absolute assent, it is possible to infer the infallible exercise of the ordinary Magisterium, for exactly the same reason, whether it is of the Pontiff or of the Church, as we explained in n.583.

649. Corollary. If we compare the infallibility of the Pontiff to the infallibility of the Church, Vatican Council I defined in general that it is the *same*, not numerically but only comparatively: D 3073-3074. But according to what we have explained in this thesis, it is the *same* first of all in its nature, cause, value and object, as is clear

41. See Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.446 and 477; Franzelin, *De traditione* p.220f; P. Nau, *loc.cit.*, 19,74-81.

42. Vacant, *La Constitution “dei Filius”* (1895) t.2 n.650-657; J. De Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Age*: t.1, *Les recherches sur les origines du Symbole* (1946).

from the defined terms of the thesis; it is further also the *same* in the immediacy of the subject, as is concluded from Scholium 1; finally, it is also the *same* from the two ways, that is, the ordinary and the extraordinary, in which it can be exercised, as one can conclude from Scholium 2.

650. Objections.⁴³ In order to solve the difficulties, which usually are drawn from history against the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff, one must pay special attention to three points: 1) *To the fact* itself, namely, whether or not it is certain historically; 2) *To the subject* of infallibility, whether or not a real definition *ex cathedra* is given, according to the principle: "Nothing is understood to be defined dogmatically, unless it is clearly stated": CIC 1323 § 3; 3) *To the object*, that is, whether or not the doctrine is a matter of faith or morals.

1. Pope Liberius (352-366) signed the Arian or Semi-Arian formula of faith.⁴⁴ Therefore he erred in the faith.

1) The *fact* historically probably is a fable, or at least there is no certainty about it.⁴⁵ 2) The *subject*, namely Pope Liberius, if perchance he did sign it, his signature was extorted from him by force, and therefore it cannot be said to come from him "on his own initiative and with his fullness of power"; therefore it cannot be called a definition *ex cathedra*.⁴⁶ 3) The *object* or the formula signed by him cannot be said to be either Arian or Semi-Arian or simply erroneous, but it can well be interpreted in an orthodox sense.⁴⁷ Hence from Pope Liberius nothing can be concluded against the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff.

651. 2. Pope Vigilius (540-555) at first condemned the so-called *Three Chapters with his first Judgment* in 548; then he revoked the condemnation with his *Ordinance* in 553; finally he condemned it with his second *Judgment* in 554. Therefore, either in one case or the other he erred. The so-called *Three Chapters* are: a) *the person and writings* of Theodore of Mopsuestia; b) the writings of Theodoret Cyrensis; c) *the letter* of Ibas of Edessa to Maris the Persian.

652. 1. These *facts* historically are certain: a) Vigilius, taken to Constantinople and detained by Emperor Justinian in 546, *by his judgment* in 548, seems to have condemned the *Three Chapters*, just as the Emperor, by a decree in 544, had previ-

43. Dieckmann, n.773; D'Herbigny, n.305,3; 396,3; Pesch, *Compendium* 1 n.323-26; Id., *Institutiones* 1 n.515-18; Muncunill, n.458-76.497; Dorsch, th.21 § 8-9; Silva-Tarouca, *loc.cit.*, 90-183, he treats the historical questions accurately. The dogmatic solutions are to be sought in the respective treatises of Theology. See H. van Laak, *Repetitorium* p.488-505.

44. St. Athanasius: Kch 417; St. Hilary: Kch 564; see 560-568; St. Jerome: Kch 630; Sozomenus: Kch 924-25.

45. St. Ambrose: Kch 597; Rufinus: Kch 715; the genuine letters of St. Liberius: Kch 550-559; St. Anastasius I, D 209; Silva-Tarouca, *loc.cit.*, 90-95. He proves from their style that the four letters attributed to Liberius are spurious (Kch 560-569): see F. di Capua, *Il ritmo prosaico nelle lettere dei Papi* (1937) 236-247.

46. St. Athanasius, *Historia Arianorum*: Kch 417; Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif.* th.31 at the end; Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.478.

47. Socrates, *Historia eccles.* 4, 12: Kch 855-859; Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.465; Pesch, *Institutiones* 1 n.515; A. D'Ales: DAFC 2, 1842-51; E. Amann: DTC 9, 631-659.

ously condemned them. The text of this *Judgment* has been lost, and so we do not know the meaning and the limits of the condemnation. b) The same Vigilius, frightened by the dangers of schism, which his *Judgment* had caused, against the will of the Emperor, promulgated his *Ordinance* on May 14, 553, by which he revoked his first *Judgment*, condemned the heretical theses as taken from the writings of Theodore and Theodoretus, but he said that their persons and the letter of Ibas, since they had not been condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, should not at that time be condemned. c) Historically it is not at all certain that Vigilius was the author of the second *Judgment*, by which in 554 the condemnation of the "Three Chapters" is fully confirmed, which on June 2, 553 the Emperor Justinian obtained from the Council of Constantinople II.⁴⁸

2) The *subject* defining *ex cathedra* cannot be said to be Vigilius because of his first *Judgment*, because, having been forced and detained by the Emperor, he lacked the necessary independence to give an infallible judgment; nor is it the case because of the *second Judgment*, because either it is not the work of Vigilius or at least he is afflicted with the same crime of force. However, the *Ordinance*, carefully prepared and freely promulgated by Vigilius, can truly be said to be his definition *ex cathedra*.⁴⁹

3) The *object* of the infallible definition in the *Ordinance* is only the propositions given to Vigilius as they were taken from the writings of Theodore and Theodoret, and also the five anathemas whereby the doctrine of Nestorius and Eutyches is condemned. The remaining precepts are disciplinary, or prudential judgments concerning the appropriateness of condemning in 553 the person of Theodore, who died in the peace of the Church in 448, and the letter of Ibas, which the Council of Chalcedon in 451 did not condemn. However, the appropriateness was very doubtful because of the dangers of schism of the Churches especially in Africa. Therefore, Pope Vigilius in no way contradicted himself by defining *ex cathedra*, what he had said *previously with his Ordinance*.

653. 3. The Council of Constantinople II in 553, contrary to the *Ordinance* of Vigilius, condemned the *Three Chapters* at the request of the Emperor Justinian. Therefore, there are two infallible definitions which contradict each other.⁵⁰

1) *The fact* is historically certain, namely, that the bishops gathered together in Constantinople in 553 condemned the *Three Chapters* to please the Emperor, in opposition to Pope Vigilius. 2) It is not certain that this Council became the *subject* of infallibility except in 591 by the confirmation of St. Gregory the Great (ML 77,478). 3) The *object* or doctrine of faith or morals defined by the Council and by Vigilius is the same. The only difference in it is that *beyond* the definition of Vigilius, the Coun-

48. Silva-Tarouca, *loc.cit.*, 165-79; see E. Amann, *Trois Chapitres*: DTC 15,1868-1924, although this author does not accurately enough and critically distinguish the spurious and doubtful documents from the genuine, which are mixed together in this affair.

49. The *Ordinance* of Vigilius: CSEL 35 n.85 p.230-320; ML 69,67-114; J. Chapman, *Studies on the Early Papacy* p.228-36.

50. The condemnation of the *Council of Constantinople II*: D 434-438.

cil adds a condemnation of the *Letter* of Ibae and of the *person* of Theodore, but for good reasons Vigilius thought that he should *abstain* from this further condemnation. Therefore there is no contradiction present of judgments as infallible, but at most *progress* both in the definition of a dogma and in the prudential judgment of opportuneness and decency.

654. 4. Pope Honorius (625-38) taught that there is one will in Christ: D 487-496. Therefore he erred in faith.

1) *The fact* from history is sufficiently certain.⁵¹ 2) *The subject* of the definition *ex cathedra* in this case cannot be said to be Honorius, since he clearly shows that he was not aware of the gravity of the question: D 487. 3) *The object* of the definition, if perhaps it should be called a definition *ex cathedra*, does not seem to be an error in faith, for from the context it is clear that Honorius is speaking about the will of Christ, not as *physically* one but as *morally* one, because of the perfect agreement of the two natural wills of the Son of God: D 487. So I will put it in form: *I distinguish the antecedent*: Honorius taught *ex cathedra* that there is one will in Christ, *denied*; he taught with a lower grade of authority, *I subdistinguish*: that in Christ there is one moral will, *conceded*; physically one, *denied*.

655. 5. The Council of Constantinople III in 680 condemned Pope Honorius as a heretic: Kch 1082-84. Therefore Honorius erred in faith by teaching that there is one natural or physical will in Christ.

1) *The fact*: historically it is certain that the body of Bishops intended to condemn Honorius as a heretic together with other Monothelite heretics. 2) *The subject* of the infallible definition cannot be said to be this body of Bishops, because it is lacking the essential and necessary confirmation of the *Head*, that is, the Pope. 3) *The object* of the definition of the Council confirmed by the Pope was not the condemnation of Honorius of heresy (D 496-498), but of negligence in putting down the heresy: Kch 1085-88.⁵² Hence in form: *I distinguish the antecedent*. The Council of Constantinople III as a body without its essential Head attempted to condemn Honorius as a heretic, *I bypass that*; as the Body of the Heads or as a Council confirmed by the Pope, *I subdistinguish*: it condemned Honorius for negligence in suppressing the Monothelite heresy, *conceded*; for an error in faith or of the Monothelite heresy, *denied*.

656. 6. Those things that are wont to be objected *against John XXII* concerning the beatific vision; *against Sixtus V* concerning the authentic Vulgate; *against Urban VIII* concerning the question of Galileo, and other similar things—in these cases it is very certain that they are not dealing with definitions *ex cathedra*.⁵³

51. Silva-Tarouca, *loc.cit.*, 180-83; A. Amann, *Honorius I*: DTC 7,93-132.

52. Pesch, *Compendium I* n.326,3; Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.466-73.

53. D'Herbigny, n.396,3; Pesch, *Compendium I* n.326. You will find the solution to these difficulties on the part of the object or doctrine, which is raised in them, explained further in the respective treatises of dogmatic Theology.

657. Appendix. *Whether or not the Pope as a private person can fall into heresy?*

Theologians dispute about this question. It seems to us “more pious and probable” to hold that God in his providence will see to it “that the Pope will never be a heretic.” For, this opinion, which was held by Bellarmine and Suarez, also was praised at *Vatican Council I* by Bishop Zinelli, Secretary for the Faith, when he said: “Because we rely on supernatural Providence, we think it is sufficiently probable that this will never happen. For God is not lacking in essentials, and therefore, if He were to permit such an evil, there would not be lacking the means to provide for it.”⁵⁴

54. *Vatican Council I*: Msi 52,1109; St. Bellarmine, *De Rom. Pontifice* 1.4 c.6; Suarez, *De fide* d.10 s.6 n.11. See Palmieri (1902) th.32 schol.1 p.708-10; Straub, n.1068; Michelitsch, § 237,9; Dorsch, 406-408; H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* p.506-509; L. Dublanchy: DTC 7,1714-17; J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEsp 14 (1954) 215f.

ARTICLE III

THE AUTHENTIC MAGISTERIUM OF THE HOLY SEE

Thesis 15. Internal and religious assent of the mind is due to the doctrinal decrees of the Holy See authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiff.

658. Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.6 n.8; Franzelin, *De Traditione* (1896) th.12 princip.7 p.118-41; Wilmers, th.72; De Groot, q.16 a.8; Palmieri, th.32 schol.2; Straub, n.963-69; Muncunill, n.511-19; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1921) th.21 p.509-21; Schultes, a.67 n.3; Dieckmann, th.29 n.775-92; Lercher, th.52 n.498-502; L. Choupin, S.J., *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint Siège* (1929) 50-95; J. Salaverri, *Valor de las encíclicas a la luz de la "Humani generis"*: MiscCom 17 (1952) 135-172; Id., *La potestad de Magisterio eclesiástico y asentimiento que le es debida*: EstEcl 29 (1955) 155-195.

659. Connection. From the thesis on the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff it is inferred that the *absolute* assent of the mind is due to him when he speaks *ex cathedra* or when it is manifestly certain that he intends to bind the faithful to such assent. Now a further question is raised: What kind of assent of the mind must be given to the decrees of the Supreme Pontiff, when he teaches on a level not touching infallibility, that is, not on the highest grade of his supreme doctrinal authority?

660. Definition of terms. By the name of the *Holy See* is meant not only the Roman Pontiff, but also the Congregations, Tribunals, Offices, through whom the same Supreme Pontiff is wont to conduct the affairs of the universal Church (CIC 7, see 246-264 [1917]).

In this thesis two terms in particular must be defined: 1) *Which decrees* are we concerned with; 2) *What kind of assent* of the mind must be given to them.

1) The *decrees* we are concerned with, in general, are judgments promulgated by the Roman Pontiff, as the authentic Teacher, universal and also supreme, but with a grade of authority not touching on his infallibility.

From their form, these decrees are of two kinds: a) The *formal* ones are those of which the Supreme Pontiff himself is shown to be the author, as generally is the case with Encyclical Letters. b) Those decrees are said to be *virtual* which are promulgated in virtue of the authority of the Supreme Pontiff legitimately participated in, as is generally the case with the decrees of the Roman Congregations (CIC cn.246-57 [1917]).

From the object, these decrees are of two kinds: a) Those decrees are *disciplinary* whose object is some precept of discipline that must be observed. Those decrees are *doctrinal* whose object is some doctrine proposed to the faithful in a teaching way. *In the thesis* we are dealing with

doctrinal decrees.

From the end intended by these decrees two of their qualities are distinguished: a) Those are *direct* by which a *doctrine* is proposed so that the faithful should hold it *as true* or *false*. b) But those are said to be *indirect* by which the Church intends “to protect a doctrine of faith or morals”; therefore in these a doctrine is proposed that must be held *as safe* or *not safe*.

661. Doctrinal decrees both direct and indirect can be published and de facto often have been published by the sacred *Congregation of the Holy Office*, in virtue of the authority communicated to it by the Supreme Pontiff. The force and reason for direct decrees are already sufficiently clear from the definition of terms. But the force and nature of the *indirect decrees* must be explained more accurately. The force of these decrees is deduced from their purpose, which in the *Congregation of the Holy Office* is to *safeguard the doctrine of faith and morals*: CIC cn.247 § 1 [1917], or to declare some doctrine to be *safe* or *not safe*. It is necessary to explain this notion more carefully.

662. “Concerning the matter we are now dealing with,” said Franzelin, “the Magisterium acts with the authority of governing given to it by God, not however with its total intensity, so to speak, nor ultimately by defining some truth, but to the extent it might seem to be necessary or opportune or sufficient to protect the doctrine; perhaps we can call this *the authority of doctrinal providence*... The inferior authority of doctrinal providence, as we have called it, which is not independent, but is communicable *with dependence on the Pontiff*, and is communicated by the same Pontiff with greater or lesser extension to certain Congregations of Cardinals... we think that judgments of this kind also outside of a *definition ex Cathedra* can be considered in such a way that they demand *obedience*, which includes *the submission of the mind*, not indeed that the doctrine be believed infallibly to be true or false; but that it is judged that the doctrine contained in such a judgment is *safe*, and for us not indeed *from a motive of divine faith*, but *from a motive of sacred authority*, whose undoubted function is to provide for the purity and security of doctrine that is to be embraced with the submission of the mind and by rejecting the contrary.¹

663. Billot agrees when he says: “There is a distinction between decrees by which a speculative truth is defined infallibly, and decrees by which the

1. Franzelin, *De divina Traditione* (1896) th.12 p.119-22. See the excellent explanation of F. Huerth, *Tuto doceri non potest*: Schol 5 (1930) 260-67.

purity of doctrine is protected, without resorting to formal definitions... To publish a decree in which a non-speculative truth is defined, but the purity of doctrine is protected, is nothing other than to decree authentically that some doctrine is safe, that is, in agreement with the rule of faith, at least with that probability which suffices that anyone can embrace it; or, on the other hand, some doctrine is not safe, or is not in agreement with the rule of faith, and that again at least with the probability, which does not have attached to it sufficient probability of the opposite... thus when the Sacred Congregations declare that some doctrine cannot safely be handed on (that is, it is not safe), we are bound to judge that this doctrine is, I do not say in itself erroneous or false or anything like that, but simply that it is not safe, and so in the future not to adhere to it because it is not safe. And if they declare that some other doctrine cannot safely be denied (that is, it is safe), we are bound to judge that this doctrine is, not only safe, but also to be followed and embraced as safe (and I am not saying that it is in itself certain precisely in virtue of this decision). But strictly speaking, that which now is not safe, especially in the composite sense of the decision, afterwards can turn out to be safe, if perhaps the competent authority, having discussed the matter again and in the light of new reasons, promulgates another decision... The later decision properly and formally cannot be said to reform the preceding one, since there is no place for reformation. For, that which now is not safe, given the present state of the reasons, can later become safe, with the discovery of new reasons; and so a decision declaring safe that which formerly had been said could not be held safely, strictly speaking is not a reformation of the opinion, but a new declaration not contrary to the previous one."² Dieckmann and Choupin embrace this same explanation.³

664. According to this doctrine, therefore, the purpose of the indirect decrees of the Congregation of the Holy Office is to declare and propose some doctrine as *safe* or *not safe*. But this means strictly: a) Positively, that the doctrine is *safe* and that it can be held without danger to faith or morals. b) Negatively, that the doctrine is *not safe* and that it cannot be held without danger to faith or morals. Therefore the judgment that such a decree presents does not concern formally the truth or falsity of the doctrine considered in itself; but really its relation to the doctrine of faith or morals *that is to be held safely*. And so there can be a doctrine which in

2. Billot, *De Ecclesia* (1927) th.19 p.445-47.

3. Dieckmann, n.787-89; L. Choupin, *Valeur des décisions doctrinales du Saint Siège* (1929) 83-86: "In these circumstances and in the present state of knowledge it is *prudent* and *safe* to adhere to this thesis as true and to abandon another as erroneous (see id., p.91).

the present state of knowledge must be judged to be non-safe, but which, with the progress of knowledge, afterwards can be thought to be safe, and vice versa. *This is the situation with indirect decrees.*

But *direct doctrinal decrees*, as we have said, propose that the doctrine itself is to be held *as true* or *as false*; hence, by way of an example, in doctrinal *Encyclical Letters*, which are directed to the whole Catholic world, the doctrine which is taught in them formally and principally is rightly proposed by theologians to be held simply as Catholic doctrine.

665. In order for *virtual decrees* to be able to be called decrees of the Holy See, it is necessary that they be approved by the Supreme Pontiff. This approval is customarily given in two ways: a) *in a common form*, by which it is signified only that the decrees are legitimate, authentic and to be promulgated; but by this approval they are not on the same level as the formal decrees of the Supreme Pontiff; b) *in a specific form*, by which it is expressly stated that the Supreme Pontiff makes these decrees his own and they must be accepted as his formal decrees. But they are said to be *approved only authentically*, because, although they have been approved in a specific form, still we suppose that they have not been approved infallibly, but with a grade of authority that is lower than a definition *ex cathedra*.

666. 2) The assent that is to be given to these decrees of the Holy See must be: a) *Submission of the mind*, and therefore the practical *conformism* is not sufficient of those who, even with a mind contrary to such submission, nevertheless *in practice* do not act otherwise than if they showed such submission; b) *An act of intellectual judgment*, and so *obediential silence of the mouth* is not sufficient of those who merely abstain from *manifesting* the contrary judgment they have; c) *Internal*, whereby a person *positively* adheres to the proposition of the Magisterium and truly thinks what the teacher thinks, and therefore the *obediential silence of the mind* is not sufficient for those who merely abstain from *forming* a different opinion; d) *Certain*, although not with the absolute certitude that excludes the *possibility* of the opposite and which is due only to an infallible decree, but with a true *relative* certitude which excludes *probability* or the fear of the opposite, and *conditioned*, namely, under this condition—unless the Church decrees otherwise with a similar or greater authority. Such assent is called *religious*, because it is offered on account of the motive of religion or because of the reverence due to God who governs the faithful through the sacred and hierarchical authority of the Church.

667. State of the question. We say in the thesis that an internal and religious assent of the mind is due to the *doctrinal decrees* of the Holy See, either *formally* published by the Supreme Pontiff or approved *in the specific form by him*, although they do not reach the grade of infallibility; and they are certain at least relatively and conditionally, as was explained in the definition of terms. Regarding the other doctrinal decrees, which we have called *virtual decrees*, the same thing consequently must be said, *while preserving the necessary proportion*.

668. Adversaries. 1) *In general*, all who deny the doctrinal authority of the Supreme Pontiff, or refuse to admit that it is universal and supreme; this matter was covered in the thesis on the infallibility of the Pontiff.

2) *Jansenists* holding that at most silence suffices, which they call obediential, towards all the decrees published concerning dogmatic facts and concerning any proposition which falls outside the ambit of the deposit of revelation: D 2390.

3) *Semi-Rationalists*, defending the complete independence of Philosophy from the faith, restrict the obligation of assent to those decrees only, which have been *infallibly* defined as dogmas of faith: D 2879, 2922.

4) *Modernists*, who, since they defend the religious sense as the fount of every religious obligation, deny the power of the Church to demand any *internal* assent of the mind: D 3407.

5) Contemporary "*advocates of novelty*" easily pass from despising scholastic theology to the neglect of and even contempt for the Teaching Authority of the Church itself... This Teaching Authority is represented by them as a hindrance to progress and an obstacle in the way of science. Some non-Catholics consider it as an unjust restraint preventing some more qualified theologians from reforming their subject... The duty that is incumbent on the faithful to flee also those errors which more or less approach heresy, and accordingly, to keep also the constitutions and decrees by which such evil opinions are proscribed and forbidden by the Holy See, is sometimes as little known as if it did not exist."⁴

669. Doctrine of the Church. It is certain from Pius IX in his *Letter "Tuas libenter"* against Semi-Rationalism: D 2879-2880, and in the *Encyclical "Quanta cura"* against Naturalism: D 2895. It is contained implicitly in the warning published by *Vatican Council I*: D 3045. Explicitly the obligation of internal assent is urged by Pius X against the *Modernists* in the *Decree "Lamentabili"*: D 3407f. See the *Motu proprio "Praestantia Scripturae"*: D 3503f. and the *Declaration of the Holy Office*: D 3681-

4. Pius XII, Encycl. "*Humani generis*": AAS 42 (1950) 567.

3682. Recently Pius XII clearly taught the doctrine of the thesis in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" where we read:

"Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority. For these matters are taught with ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say, *He who hears you hears me* (Luke 10:16); and generally what is expounded and inculcated in Encyclical Letters already for other reasons appertains to Catholic doctrine. But if the Supreme Pontiffs in their official documents purposely pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that the matter, according to the mind and will of the same Pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians."⁵

670. Theological note. Therefore the thesis is *Catholic doctrine* and can be defended as *theologically certain*.

671. Proof. The Holy See 1) *has the right* to demand internal and religious assent to doctrinal decrees formally approved by the Supreme Pontiff, and 2) *de facto does demand* such assent. But a correlated obligation necessarily responds to every right and the warranty of an obligation is due to the exaction of a right. Therefore, the internal and religious assent of the mind is due to the decrees of the Holy See that have been authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiff.

672. *The antecedent is proved in the first place. The Holy See has the right* to demand such assent to authentic decrees, which correspond to the doctrinal power that published them, and which is necessary in order to obtain the end of such power. Therefore, the Holy See has the right to demand internal and religious assent to the doctrinal decrees authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiff.

The minor. a) Internal assent of the mind corresponds to the power of teaching by which authentic decrees are published, because they are decreed with true doctrinal authority; religious assent also corresponds to it, because the power by which authentic decrees are published is truly sacred and exercised under the divine assistance.

The minor. b) Internal and religious assent is necessary in order to obtain the *end* of the same power. For, the end of doctrinal power, by which authentic decrees are published, is to lead the faithful certainly and

5. Pius XII, *loc.cit.*, 568; see J. Salaverri, *Valor de las Enciclicas a la luz de la "Humani generis"*; MiscCom 17 (1952) 135-172; J.C. Fenton, *The "Humani generis" and the Holy Father's Ordinary Magisterium*; AmerEcclRev 125 (1951) 53-62.

securely to embrace and firmly hold the doctrine of faith and morals so that they are protected against the dangers of erring in the doctrine of faith and morals. Indeed, without the obligation of an internal assent the mind of the faithful would freely wander because of uncertain and unsafe doctrines, and therefore it would either certainly err in obtaining the teachings of the deposit of faith, or at least it would be subject continually to the dangers of erring in the doctrine of faith and morals, and de facto, given the reality of human weakness, it would also often deviate from the true doctrine of faith and morals. Therefore, because of the religious motive of avoiding dangers to faith and morals, internal assent to authentically approved decrees is necessary in order to obtain the end of the doctrinal power of the Church.

673. *The antecedent is proved secondly. The Holy See de facto* requires internal and religious assent to the doctrinal decrees authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiff. a) *In general*, this is clear from *Vatican Council I*: D 3045, and from the precept of CIC 1324 [1917], whereby the same decree of the Vatican is urged. b) It is certain from Pius IX in his *Letter "Tuas libenter"* (D 2880) concerning the obligation of giving assent also to the Roman Congregations, and at least implicitly in the Encyclical "*Quanta cura*": D 2895f. c) *That the Holy See requires internal assent* is shown from Leo XIII in his Encyclical "*Immortale Dei*": D 1880 [34th ed.], and from Pius X in the Decree "*Lamentabili*": D 3407. d) The assent which the Holy See requires is *religious*, that is, to be offered because of the motive of religion; this is deduced from the fact that obedience is demanded to authentic decrees under the pain of serious guilt: D 3503, 3543-3547; "Now it belongs to religion," says St. Thomas, "to show reverence to one God, under one aspect, namely, as the first principle of the creation and government of things,"⁶ but by our obedience to such decrees we show reverence to God inasmuch as he is the first principle of the supernatural government of the faithful.

674. Scholium 1. On the nature of the assent that must be given to the decrees, concerning which the thesis deals, according to the opinions of the authors. Since the intellect is a necessary power and is not moved to an absolute assent except by the evidence of the object or by the infallibility of testimony, the authors ask, what the nature of the assent is which is due to the doctrinal decrees that do not attain the infallible grade of authority? All those responding agree that the due assent is *not absolute* or metaphysically certain, which is due only to *infallible* decrees.

Furthermore, in determining the nature of such assent, 1) the following authors say

6. S.Th. II-II, q. 81, a. 3.

that it is *morally certain* either *formally* or *equivalently*: Franzelin, Palmieri, Pesch, Billot, De Groot, Hurter, Hettinger, Scheeben, Muncunill, Schultes, Dieckmann, Al-Bárcena, and others.⁷ 2) Others say *in addition* that it is *conditioned*: Choupin, Wilmers, Straub, Maroto, Lercher, and others.⁸ 3) Schiffini calls it *suppositional*, which of course does not seem sufficient to others.⁹ In the state of the question we have given our opinion in this matter.

675. When we say the assent due to authentic decrees is only *morally certain and conditioned*, it can happen that sometimes it can be suspended. Hence we ask, under what conditions is it allowed to suspend such assent? Straub responds: To the decrees we are now considering “per se an assent is fitting, which can be said to be implicitly and interpretatively conditioned, inasmuch as a son of the Church, knowing that the decree is not peremptory, is so disposed that he does not wish to withhold his assent, if at some time the Church judges otherwise through an infallible decision, or he himself perceives that the matter is opposed to the truth.

“Certainly it can happen *per accidens* that a decree may appear to someone as either certainly false or opposed to reason so much that the force of this reason by no means is overcome by the weight of the sacred authority. Surely, since a reasonable submission is demanded, if that should happen, *it will be allowed to disagree*, but if not that, *it will be allowed to doubt* or also to think that the opinion disagreeing with the sacred decree is still probable; however, out of reverence for the sacred authority it will not be right to contradict it publicly...; but silence must be observed, which is called *obediential*, or the difficulty should be explained modestly to the sacred tribunal, or have recourse to a higher tribunal and an infallible judgment...” However, “let each one take care lest, preoccupied with the love of his own opinion, he freely deceive himself, since he will have to give a strict account to the Lord who reads all hearts.”¹⁰ Schultes embraced this teaching and made it his own.¹¹

676. Choupin thinks, first, if serious reasons for doubting appear that it is licit to inquire into them, *privately*, however, but in no way publicly, lest it damage the authority of the Congregation; but if the reasons against the decree seem to be completely overwhelming, then it is necessary to refer the matter to the Sacred Congregation itself with due reverence; but in the interim it is not yet licit to suspend assent. Second, but

7. Franzelin, *loc.cit.*; Palmieri (1902) th.32 schol2 p.710f.; Pesch, *Praelectiones* 1 n.521; Billot, *loc.cit.*; De Groot, q.16 a.8; Scheeben, *Handbuch d.k. Dogmatik* I (1873) p.250; Hurter, *Compendium* I (1909) 535; Hettinger-Weber, *Lehrbuch der Fundamentaltheologie* (1913) 735f.; Muncunill, n.515; Schultes, a.67,5; Dieckmann, n.779-791; Alonso-Bárcena, *De Ecclesiae Magisterio* (1945) th.8 p.83.

8. Choupin, *loc.cit.*, 82-92; Wilmers, m.241; Straub, n.9678; Lercher, n.499; Ph. Maroto, *Inst. Iur. Can* I (1919) 418 “Given these circumstances and this state of knowledge, it is *prudent and safe* to hold this as true” (Choupin, *loc. cit.*).

9. S. Schiffini, *De virtutibus infusis* (1904) 215. See Dieckmann, n.779-791. Choupin holds that the assent must be certain with moral certitude understood in a broad sense, which *theoretically* is not strict certitude, but practically is equivalent to it, although he calls it “a great probability” (*loc.cit.*, 83-93).

10. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.968f.

11. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.67,5,4,C.

if the reasons against the decree are absolutely evident, which Choupin thinks is hardly possible, then only *silence* is a matter of obligation which they call *obediential*.¹²

However, it seems to us *that in this second case mere obediential silence is not sufficient*; because, although the decree is fallible, and grave reasons are opposed to it, nevertheless the judgment of theologians can also be erroneous and weakened by difficulties. Therefore we think that even then one must accept the decree of the sacred Congregation, at least as probable, until either the Congregation itself or a higher tribunal has decreed something about the matter.

677. Scholium 2. On the proper object of the assent. Some authors, like Choupin and Journet, seem to hold that the Supreme Pontiff in these decrees does not intend to propose a doctrine as true or false, as certain or erroneous, but only *as safe* or *not safe*; and therefore they seem to deny the decrees which in the definition of terms we have called *direct* (n.660.664).¹³

With Palmieri, De Groot and others, it seems to us that of the decrees, with which the thesis is concerned, some propose doctrine merely *as safe* or *not safe* (D 3645-3647), but others propose doctrine simply *as true* or *as false*, *as certain* or *erroneous* (D 921ff.). Indeed, the assent of the mind, which is required, by its nature demands that the faithful hold with their internal mind *the very same thing* that the Supreme Pontiff simply enunciates, and that they directly affirm *the very same thing* that he himself asserts. Therefore, when the decrees say that some doctrine is safe or not safe, it must be held that it is such—safe or not safe; however, when they propose a doctrine as certain or erroneous, as true or false, then we must hold and affirm that it really is certain or erroneous, true or false, as the decrees precisely enunciate it, according to the clear mind of Leo XIII.¹⁴

678. Objections. 1. The Church cannot oblige to internal acts. Therefore it cannot require the internal assent of the mind to decrees concerning non-revealed truths.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Church cannot oblige to internal acts by the power of teaching, *denied*; by the power of governing, *subdistinguish*: with the vicarious power of God, *denied*; with the social power proper to the Church, *again I subdistinguish*: if the acts are mixed, *denied*; if the acts are merely internal, *again I subdistinguish*: directly, *I bypass that point*: indirectly, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent and deny the consequence*.

The Church *de facto* requires *an internal assent of the mind* and indeed *one that is firm above all things* regarding official decrees concerning dogmatic facts in the strict sense, that is, concerning the orthodox or heterodox meaning of the author as an author of

12. Choupin, *loc.cit.*, 88-92. F. Diekamp agrees, *Katholische Dogmatik* I (1923) 56. See Dieckmann, n.792,9.

13. Choupin, *loc.cit.*, p.53-55, 83-95; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* I p.418-428.

14. D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif.* th.32 schol.2; De Groot, *Summa de Ecclesia* q.16 a.8; Pesch, *Praelect.* I n.521; J. Salaverri, *loc.cit.*, in note 5 p. 165-168; Leo XIII, Encyclical "*Immortale Dei*": "It is necessary for everyone to stand by the judgment of the Apostolic See, and to have the same opinion as that held by it" (D 1880 [34th ed.]; J. Salaverri, *La potestad del Magisterio y asentimiento que le es debido*: EstEcl 29 (1955) 155-195.

some human text, as is explained in thesis 17: D 2390. Therefore, in a similar way, it can also demand *assent of the mind that is simply firm* to the decrees, because it is in the same genus which can be more or less.¹⁵ You can consult the approved authors on the power of the Church which is proper or vicarious, direct or indirect with regard to internal acts.¹⁶

679. 2. The decrees of provincial Councils approved by the Supreme Pontiff become infallible. Therefore, in a similar way, the decrees of the Holy See approved by the same Supreme Pontiff also become infallible.

I distinguish the antecedent. Approved by the Supreme Pontiff in a common form, *denied*; in the specific form, *I subdistinguish*: with the express manifestation of his intention of decreeing infallibly, *conceded*; without such intention manifestly express, *denied*. Likewise, *I distinguish the consequent and deny the consequence*.¹⁷

680. 3. The signing by *Liberius* of the symbol of Sirmio, the condemnation by *Vigilius* of the "Three Chapters," the teaching of *Honorius* on the one will of Christ, although they are not *ex cathedra* definitions, however they seem to be decrees authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiff. But internal assent of the mind is not due to them. Therefore internal assent of the mind is not due to all decrees authentically approved by the Supreme Pontiffs.

Having supposed what we said about these three cases in the previous thesis, now we will respond further to the difficulty. *I bypass the major and distinguish the minor.* The internal assent of the mind is not due to such decrees after these decrees have been completed and reformed later by the Holy See itself, *conceded*; internal assent of the mind was not due to them before they had been further completed and reformed by the Holy See itself, *I subdistinguish*: internal assent of the mind absolutely certain and irreformable was not due, *conceded*; morally certain and conditioned, *again I subdistinguish*: internal assent of the mind morally certain and conditioned was not due to those decrees understood in the sense in which the adversaries falsely interpret them, *conceded*; but in the sense that they have and in which they were published, *denied*. On the true sense in which these facts concerning *Liberius*, *Vigilius* and *Honorius* are to be understood, consult the History of the Church and the dogmatic treatise on the Incarnate Word.¹⁸

681. 4. Morally certain assent is not due to the decrees of *John XXII* on the beatific vision and of *Sixtus V* on the authenticity of the Vulgate. Therefore we have a difficulty.

The supposition of the antecedent is denied, or that the things mentioned can be said to be decrees *authentically* approved by the Supreme Pontiff. For, *John XXII* proposed a certain opinion only with hesitation and as a private teacher, and the Constitution of

15. See Straub, *loc.cit.*, n.967.

16. L. Rodrigo, *Praelectiones theologico-morales Comillenses* 2 Tractatus de Legibus (1944) n.96-102; Straub, n.665-81; G. Michiels, *Normae gener. Iur. Can.* I (1949) p.262-278.

17. On the twofold grade of authority within the same species of approval "in the specific form," see Wilmers, n.240; Muncunill, n.517.

18. On these facts, which are attributed to *Liberius*, *Vigilius* and *Honorius*, consult everything we wrote in the preceding thesis, objections 1-5.

Sixtus V was not promulgated.¹⁹

682. 5. At least to the decree of the Congregation promulgated against the teaching of Galileo under Urban VIII no assent of the mind is due. Therefore we have a difficulty.

I distinguish the antecedent. The decree against the teaching of Galileo was approved by the Supreme Pontiff in the specific form, *denied*; in the common form, *I subdistinguish*: assent of the mind was not due to such a decree after it was already clear, with the progress of science, that the teaching of Galileo could be defended without the danger of erring in the matter of faith and morals, *conceded*; a conditioned assent of the mind was not due during that imperfect state of science when the decree was published, *denied*.

683. When the decree was given, Protestants condemned the Copernican system, and constantly objected that the Catholic Church had abandoned the doctrine of the inerrancy of Scripture, since she permitted the teachings of Copernicus and Galileo, which could not be reconciled with the inerrancy of Scripture. Indeed, according to the state of science before the middle of the 17th century, it was not yet apparent how the system of Galileo could be reconciled with the inerrancy of Scripture, therefore rightly at the time the Sacred Congregation, in order to defend the doctrine of the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, said: "We think and declare that you, Galileo, through the things said in the trial and admitted by you above, have been referred to this Holy Office as strongly suspected of heresy, that is, of having held and believed a doctrine that is false and opposed to the sacred and divine Scriptures, namely, that the sun is the center of the world and that it does not move from the East to the West, and that the earth moves and is not the center of the world, and that one can hold and defend as probable an opinion after it has been declared and defined as contrary to Holy Scripture."

Therefore, the whole reason for the condemnation was the necessity, in those unavoidable circumstances, of protecting the faithful from the grave danger of doubting the inerrancy of Scripture; for, it was not yet apparent that the opinions of Galileo, which at the time were hotly controverted, could be reconciled with inerrancy. But to the decree understood in this sense, which is its proper and strict meaning, assent of the mind that is morally certain, relative and conditioned was required to be given by the faithful, that is, until with the progress of science it would now be apparent that the danger was no longer present of denying the doctrine of faith concerning the inerrancy of Holy Scripture.²⁰

19. D'Herbigny, *Theol. De Ecclesia*, n.396,2,C; Pesch, *Compendium I* n.326,8-9; X. le Bachelet, *Bellarmin et la Bible Sixto-Clementine* (1911); A. Merk, *Bibel und Bulle Sixtus V*: Schol 2 (1927) 515-40; A. Vaccari, *Instist. bibl.* 1,3 n.124; see above tr.2 n.213.

20. For the text of the judgment against Galileo, see *Le opera di Galileo*, ediz. Nazionale, vol. 19 (1918) p. 405; M. D'Herbigny, n.138,3,B; n.396,2,D; De Vregille, *Galilée*: DAFC 2,147-92; Vacandard, *Galilée*: DTC 6,1058-94; Sánchez Navarro Neumann, *San Roberto Belarmino y el primer proceso de Galileo Galilei*: Ibérica 36 (1931) 359-66, 376-81, 392-97; H. de L'Epinois, *Galilée, son procès, sa condamnation*: RevQHist 3 (1867) 68-171; Vacandard, *Etudes de critique et d'histoire religieuse* 1 (1913) 293-393; L. Choupin, *Valeur des décisions du Saint Siège* (1928) p. 159-86; L. Pastor, *Historia de los Papas* t.25 p.226-39; t.28 p.287-304; A. Gemelli, *Scienza e Fede nell'uomo Galilei*, and O. Giacchi, *Considerazioni sui due processi contro Galileo*: Pubblicazioni dell'Università Cattolica di Milano, ser. 5 vol.20, *Nel terzo Centenario di Galileo* (1942) p.1-27, 383-406.

CHAPTER III

On the object of the infallible Magisterium

ARTICLE I

ON THE PRIMARY OBJECT OF INFALLIBILITY

Thesis 16. Per se revealed truths are the primary and direct object of the infallible Magisterium.

684. S.Th. I, q. 36, a. 2 ad 2; II-II, q. 1, a. 6 ad 1; a. 10; q. 2, a. 5; q. 11, a. 2; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.8 n.4-7; Wilmers, th.73f.; Palmieri, § 25.26.29; De Groot, q.9 a.1; Pesch, *Praelect.* I. th.47; Id., *Compend.* I th.40; Straub, th.24; Muncunill, n.445; Schultes, a.33; Bainvel, *De Eccl.* th.27; Michelitsch, § 241; Zubizarreta, I n.493-97; D'Herbigny, th.38; Dorsch, p.409-13; De Guiberrt, th.37; Zapelena, 2 th.19; Alonso Bárcena, th.19; Calcagno, l.4 c.3 a.1.

685. Connection. In the preceding theses we treated the *institution* of the infallible Magisterium and its *subject*. We now logically ask the question: What is the object of this same infallibility? So in this article we will consider the *primary object*.

686. Definition of terms. Among the authors there are different ways in which this matter is presented. We will explain only the principal ideas according to the common doctrine.

1. *In the abstract.* The object of infallibility in general are all the truths, which are taught infallibly by the Magisterium of the Church.

This general object is distinguished into two forms: a) *Direct and primary* is that which by reason of itself and because of itself is touched by the infallible act. b) *Indirect and secondary* is that which by reason of another and because of it, that is, because of the primary object, is touched by the infallible act.

687. 2. In the concrete. The object of infallibility, stated generically, is "doctrine on faith or morals pertaining to the edification of the Church" (D 1507, 3073-3074), as was explained in the thesis on the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff.¹

Indeed, according to St. Thomas "A thing may be of faith in two ways: in one way, *directly and principally*, e.g. the articles of faith; in another

1. V. Gasser, *Relator fidei*: Msi 52,1226.1295.1316; Grandérath, *Const. dogmat. Conc. Vatic.* 54-61. See above n.599f.

way, *indirectly and secondarily*, e.g., those matters, the denial of which leads to the corruption of some article of faith.”² Hence a twofold object of infallibility is distinguished: one is *direct and primary*, which is the truths formally revealed, like the articles of faith; the other is *indirect and secondary*, which includes truths that are said to be virtually revealed, or which are necessarily connected with formally revealed truths.

688. 3. *The direct object*, or the truths *formally revealed* are those which God intends to manifest by his own witnessing word, according to the nature of human speech and in virtue of the meaning of the terms themselves which he uses. God is wont to reveal them in two ways: a) *Explicitly* revealed are those truths which are contained clearly in the sources of revelation. b) *Implicitly* revealed are those truths which either *in* the explicitly revealed truths *alone* by a mere analysis of them are discovered to be included, or *from* the explicitly revealed alone are deduced *immediately*.

Per se revealed are truths formally revealed which, because of their soteriological importance, God intends to reveal principally; or, as St. Thomas says appropriately: “those things are in themselves of faith, which order us directly to eternal life”; they are especially *the articles of faith*, which are included in the various Creeds of the Church.

Per accidens revealed are the truths formally revealed, which because of their merely external or contingent coherence with *per se* revealed truths, God also intends to reveal: there are many truths of this kind in the Scriptures, for example in Matt. 13:1-2; 2 Tim. 4:9-21.³

689. “*The Deposit of Faith*,” in the strict sense, is the complex of all truths *per se revealed* by God, either explicitly or implicitly, which, having been received by the Apostles, must be reverently guarded and explained by the Church: D 2860, 3069-3070. This denomination already used by St. Paul (1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14), and explained by St. Vincent of Lérins (R 2173), finally was authentically declared by *Vatican Council I*: D 3020.⁴

690. State of the question. We say in the thesis that truths *per se* and *formally revealed*, whether explicitly or implicitly, which constitute the deposit of faith, are the primary object of infallibility.

2. S.Th. II-II, q. 11, a.2; see I, q. 32, a. 4; *In 1 Cor* 11,19 lect.4.

3. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 6 ad 1; q. 2, a. 5. See M. Cano, *De locis* I.12 c.3 concl.3.

4. See De Guibert, n.327; Pesch, *Praelectiones* I n.531; Lercher, I n.503; Dorsch, p.411f.; Franzelin, *De Traditione* th.12 schol.1 princ.2 p.112-13.

691. Adversaries. 1) *In general*, all those are adversaries who deny either revelation or infallibility. In this category are especially the *Rationalists*, who hold that, outside of man's reason, no other doctrinal authority, whether revealing or declaring infallibly, can be acknowledged; also the *Naturalists*, who acknowledge nothing except the things pertaining to the merely natural order. We already treated this in the theses on infallibility.

2) *In particular*, *Protestants* are adversaries; they want to admit no other infallible authority except Scripture *alone*, as in our time is the case with K. Barth who said: "The office and mission of the Church is to announce to the whole world that it is absolutely impossible that there should be anything revealed or in the strict sense the authoritative word of God, or another form of divine rule *absolutely binding* except the Sacred Scripture *alone*." And likewise E. Brunner: "No ecclesiastical *definition of faith* is infallible, but it is always *essentially* subject to approval and revision."⁵

692. Doctrine of the Church. The object of the Magisterium of the Church *in general* is said to be "doctrine on faith or morals." What is meant by this expression can be explained by the words of Leo XIII in his Encyclical "*Sapientiae christianae*":

"For the things contained in the divine oracles have reference to God in part, and in part to man, and to whatever is necessary for the attainment of his eternal salvation. Now, both these, that is to say, *what we are bound to believe* and *what we are obliged to do*, are laid down, as we have stated, by the Church using her divine right, and in the Church by the Supreme Pontiff. Wherefore it belongs to the Pope to judge authoritatively *what things the sacred oracles contain, as well as what doctrines are in harmony, and what in disagreement*, with them; and also, for the same reason, to show forth *what things are to be accepted as right, and what to be rejected as worthless; what it is necessary to do and what to avoid doing*, in order to attain eternal salvation. For, otherwise, *there would be no sure interpreter of the commands of God, nor would there be any safe guide showing man the way he should live*." Hence it is clear what things pertain to faith and morals.⁶

Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" teaches very clearly that the proper object of the Magisterium is the "Deposit of Faith," when he says: "This sacred Office of Teacher in matters faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ our Lord the whole *deposit of faith*—Sacred Scripture and divine Tradition—to be preserved, guarded and interpreted... Together with the sources of positive theology God has given to his Church

5. K. Barth, *Die Schrift und die Kirche: Die Autorität und Bedeutung der Bibel* (1947) 8; E. Brunner, *Offenbarung und Vernunft* (1941) 129; see DivTGh (Fr) 29 (1951) 319-322.

6. Leo XIII, Encyclical "*Sapientiae christianae*": ASS 22 (1890) 395; Msi 52 1295; Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia* th.5 p.54 note 1.

a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This *deposit of faith* our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, nor even to theologians, but *only* to the Teaching Authority of the Church... Indeed, this Teaching Authority was instituted by Christ the Lord in order to guard and interpret divinely revealed truths.”⁷

693. We deduce the infallibility of the Church concerning the primary object: 1) from the decrees of *Vatican Council I*; 2) from the definition of Pontifical infallibility; 3) from the further definitions, which were prepared on this matter by the same Vatican Council.

1) That the object of infallibility is *per se* revealed truths *was defined by Vatican Council I*: D 3011, 3020, 3069-3070.

2) *The thesis* on the direct and primary object of infallibility is contained *implicitly* in the definition of pontifical infallibility, since the Council says that its object is “doctrine concerning faith or morals”: D 3074.

For, the Secretary, Bishop Grasser, in the name of the *Committee for the Faith*, while explaining to the Fathers the definition of the Council, said: “In this definition it deals in #4 *with the object* of infallibility, which was promised in order to guard and interpret the whole deposit of faith. Therefore, as a whole it is easily made clear that the object of infallibility is the doctrine concerning faith or morals. Now, in the very word of God itself is contained also without doubt that infallibility extends at least to those things which *per se* constitute the deposit of faith, namely in order to define the dogmas of faith, and what comes to the same thing, to condemn heresies... The present definition enuntiates the object of infallibility *only in a general way*, when it says, namely, that it is *doctrine concerning faith or morals*... In this object, so stated *in a general way*, the infallibility of the Pontiff extends neither less nor more broadly than the infallibility of the Church extends in her definitions of doctrine concerning faith and morals. Hence, just as no one denies that it is heretical to deny the infallibility of the Church in defining dogmas of faith, in virtue of this decree of the Vatican *it will not be less heretical to deny the infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff in definitions of the dogmas of faith.*”⁸

Hence “in virtue of the Vatican decree” itself it is *formally implicitly defined* that the object of infallibility is the *per se revealed truths*, which constitute *the deposit of faith*.

3) *In the decrees of Vatican Council I*, which were prepared, the doctrine of the thesis was directly and explicitly defined; hence the thesis is proximate to a definition.

In Outline I c.9: “We are teaching that *the object of infallibility extends as far as*

7. Pius XII, Encyclical “*Humani generis*”: AAS 42 (1950) 567.569.563, and the Encyclical “*Ad Sinarum gentem*”: AAS 47 (1955) 10-11.

8. V. Gasser, at *Vatican Council I*: Msi 52,1225.1226.1227.

the deposit of faith extends, and as the office of guarding it demands; and so that the prerogative of infallibility in its fullness includes both the whole revealed word of God, and everything, although in itself not revealed, still is of such a nature that, without it the former cannot safely be preserved, cannot be proposed for certain or effectively defended."⁹

*The revised Outline agrees, c.7: "Although the ecclesiastical Magisterium properly and especially is concerned with the written and handed down word of God; nevertheless, it is necessary that it also be extended to all those things concerning which, unless a judgment has been given, the protection of the divine deposit cannot be exercised."*¹⁰

694. Theological note. The thesis is *implicitly defined divine faith in Vatican Council I.*

695. Proof. *The per se revealed truths are the primary object of infallibility.* a) *It is proved from the efficacious assistance of God, absolutely promised* in Matt. 28:20 and John 14:25f.; 16:12-15. The primary object of infallibility are those truths, which Christ primarily and per se commanded his Apostles to teach perpetually under the efficacious assistance of God promised to them absolutely. But the truths, which Christ primarily and per se commanded his Apostles to teach perpetually under the efficacious assistance of God promised to them absolutely, are the per se revealed truths. Therefore the primary object of infallibility are the per se revealed truths.

The major is clear from the known power of the assistance given by God, as was explained in the thesis on the institution of the infallible Magisterium in n.506-507.

The minor is evident from the whole economy of revelation instituted by Christ, and also from the formal and explicit command of Christ to preach the doctrine of Christ: Matt. 10:27; 28:20; Luke 22:44-49; John 14:25f.; 16:12f.

b) *It is proved from the obligation imposed by faith* to accept what the Apostles preached: Mark 16:15-16. The primary object of infallibility are those truths which Christ primarily and per se commanded his Apostles to preach, so that they would be believed by all under the risk of eternal salvation. But the truths of this kind that must be believed by all under the risk of eternal salvation are the per se revealed truths. Therefore the primary object of infallibility are the per se revealed truths.

The major is clear because such an absolute obligation of faith cannot be imposed unless it concerns infallibly proposed truths, as was explained in n.525.

9. Msi, 51,543.

10. Msi 53,313.

The minor is evident from the terms and from the nature and purpose of revelation itself.

696. c) *It is proved as the conclusion* which immediately and necessarily is deduced from the already proved *infallibility of the Church*. The Church is infallible. Therefore necessarily she must know, and therefore de facto does know, to which truths her infallibility extends. But the Church theoretically and practically attributes to herself infallibility in defining per se revealed truths. Therefore the object of the infallibility of the Church are the per se revealed truths.

The first conclusion is clear, because otherwise the infallibility of the Church would be a prerogative that could never be put into act; but such a situation would be especially repugnant because infallibility is an eminently practical faculty.

The minor is proved part by part. In the first place, *theoretically*. The Church attributes to herself infallibility in defining per se revealed truths in a special way in *Vatican Council I*: D 3020:

“the doctrine of faith that God has revealed is like a divine trust to be faithfully kept and infallibly declared”: D 3070 “the Holy Spirit was promised that, with his assistance, they might reverently guard and faithfully explain the revelation or deposit of faith that was handed down through the successors of Peter”: D 3074 the Church “possesses infallibility in defining the doctrine concerning faith or morals,” which was treated above when we explained the doctrine of the Church in n.693.

In the second place, the *minor* is proved *practically*. The Church attributes to herself infallibility in defining per se revealed truths, especially when she defines the Creeds of faith, which contain very important per se revealed truths: such are the Creeds of Nicaea D 125-126, *Constantinople* D 150, *Trent* D 1862-1870. The definition of the *Council of Chalcedon* also belongs here D 301-303, which adds at the end: “no one may propose any other faith than this...” But in the definitions of the *Assumption*, *Immaculate Conception* and of the pontifical *Infallibility* it is explicitly stated that these definitions have to do with an object that is per se revealed: D 2803-2804 concerning the *Immaculate* “the doctrine is revealed by God and therefore is to be believed by all”; D 3074 that the Roman Pontiff is infallible “we define to be a dogma revealed by God”; the *Assumption* “we define to be a divinely revealed dogma.”¹¹

697. Objections.¹² 1. The things that have been affirmed by the testimony of God himself cannot obtain any further firmness from an infallible definition. Therefore the definition of per se revealed truths is useless.

11. Pius XII, *Const. Apost. "Munificentissimus Deus"*: AAS 42 (1950) 770; D 3903).

12. See De San, *De Ecclesia* n.239; De Groot, *De Ecclesia* q.9 a.1.

I distinguish the antecedent. In themselves or intrinsically, *conceded*; regarding us or extrinsically, *denied*. For, revealed truth *in itself* or intrinsically enjoys a firmness than which a greater cannot be given, since it is based on the knowledge and veracity of the first truth itself. However, *regarding us* and extrinsically it often happens that either the fact or the meaning of the revelation is not sufficiently clear to us; and then it is necessary that they be made known to us infallibly in order to base the act of faith on an infallible foundation.

2. The purpose of infallibility is faith. But faith is necessary only for the principal revealed truths. Therefore infallibility is necessary only for the principal revealed truths.

I distinguish the major. The purpose of infallibility is faith, whereby either explicitly or implicitly the whole deposit of faith is believed, *conceded*; which embraces only truths explicitly to be believed as necessary for salvation, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor; I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

3. If the Church is infallible concerning per se revealed truths, by an infallible act it will be able to establish new dogmas. But this is impossible after the Apostles. Therefore the Church concerning per se revealed truth is not infallible.

I distinguish the major. The Church by an infallible act, that is, based on its assistance alone, will be able to constitute completely new dogmas, *denied*; it will be able to propose new dogmas, *I subdistinguish*: new with regard to us, that is, by declaring or explaining to us those things contained in the deposit of faith received from the Apostles, *conceded*; new with regard to us, that is, by introducing others that objectively are not contained in that deposit, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way, etc.*

3. By new dogmas relative to us a difference is introduced into the Church concerning truths that must be believed per se. But such a difference cannot be admitted. Therefore....

I distinguish the major. It introduces a difference concerning truths per se necessary and at least implicitly having to be believed, *denied*; concerning truths explicitly to be believed, *I subdistinguish*: a difference is introduced so that the Church must believe truths contrary to those previously believed, *denied*; so that she must believe more distinctly what she believed previously in an obscure manner, *conceded*. *I also distinguish the minor, deny the consequent and the consequence.*

5. At least a difference concerning what is to be believed per se must be admitted. But such a difference conflicts with the axiom that the faith of the Church has always been the same.¹³ Therefore....

I distinguish the major. An objective difference in what is to be believed must be admitted, *denied*; a subjective difference, *I subdistinguish*: a modal and gradual difference, or in the way and grade of giving assent to the same truths of the faith, *conceded*; a substantial difference, or one in the very nature of the assent given to faith, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*

13. See S.Th., I-II, q. 103, a. 4; 107, a. 1 ad 1q; a. 3, ad 1; III, q. 8, a. 3 ad 3; q. 70, a. 1.

ARTICLE II

ON THE SECONDARY OBJECT OF INFALLIBILITY

Thesis 17. Other truths that are necessarily connected with the revealed truths are the secondary or indirect object of infallibility.

698. S.Th. I, q. 1, a. 6 ad 2; q. 32, a. 4; II-II, q. 11, a. 2; *Quodl.* Q. 9, a. 16; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.8 n.8f.; *De Relig.* Tr.71.2 c.17 n.17-23; tr.101.3 c.4 n.5-11; Wilmers, th.74-78; Palmieri, § 40; Hurter, I n.273-79,507; De Groot, q.9 a.2-6; Pesch, *Prael.* Th.48-51; Id., *Compend.* 1 th.41-43; Straub, th.25; Muncunill, n.482-510; Dieckmann, th.31; Schultes, a.34-38; Michelitsch, § 242; Bainvel, *De Eccl.* th.28-30; Zubizarreta, I n.498-511; Lercher, I th.53; Dorsch, p.413-36; De Guibert, th.38; Zapelena, th.19; Alonso Bárcena, th.10-14; Calcagno, I.4 c.3 a.2.

699. Connection. In the preceding thesis we dealt with the *primary* or *direct* object of infallibility; therefore our next task in this thesis is to explain what the *secondary* or *indirect* object is of the same infallibility.

700. Definition of terms. *The secondary or indirect object of infallibility* is that which not because of itself or for its own sake, but *because of another* and *by reason of another* object, namely the primary one, is attained by the infallible act.

The secondary or indirect object of infallibility is constituted by all those truths which, even though in themselves they are not revealed, still have a necessary connection with revealed truths, and therefore are usually said to be *connected with revealed truths* or also *virtually revealed*. But those things “with which matters of faith and morals are not concerned either directly or indirectly, the Church leaves to the free discussion of experts,” as Pius XII says. Such things can be, according to Pius XI, “those matters of art (technical), for which the Church does not have the proper means and is not responsible for.”

Virtually revealed truths are those which are so connected with the formally revealed that *by a legitimate and necessary consequence*, through the mediation of another truth that is *naturally* certain, *they are deduced from them*. Therefore they are said to be necessarily *connected* with revealed truths, because their infallible certitude is thought to be absolutely necessary for us “to fully protect, properly explain and efficaciously defend the deposit of faith. These truths *in themselves* are not revealed, nor do they pertain to the *deposit of faith*, but they do concern its protection.”¹

Truths of this kind *necessarily connected with revealed truths* are usually reduced to three kinds, which are: A. *Speculative truths* logically connected

1. Msi 52,1226.1295; Pius XII, “*Humani generis*”: AAS 42 (1950) 572; Pius XI, “*Quadragesimo anno*”: AAS 23 (1931) 190. See Franzelin, *De Traditione* th.12 schol.1 princ.3-5 p.113-116.

either consequently or in a presupposed way with the revealed truths; B. *Dogmatic facts* whether simply such or especially doctrinal; C. *Dispositive decrees* about discipline in general, and in particular on the canonization of Saints and on the approbation of religious Orders, which are said to be connected with revealed truths *in a purposeful way*, because they help very much to obtain the end of revelation which is the sanctification of souls.

701. A. *Speculative truths* connected with revealed truths are those from the negation of which the negation of a revealed truth follows logically and with metaphysical necessity. The connection of such truths with revealed truths can take two forms: a) *presupposed*, or of those truths which are presupposed before revelation and faith; for example, this would be one: man by the light of reason certainly can know supra-sensible things; the truths of this kind are called *the preambles of faith*.²

b) *Consecutive*, or of those truths which certainly and necessarily follow, with metaphysical necessity, from one revealed premise and from another naturally certain premise. Truths deduced in this way are called *theological conclusions*. In order for them to be true theological conclusions it is necessary that they be derived by a truly deductive syllogism, or by a syllogism which *contains in the conclusion a new concept* that is not contained in the revealed premise. This takes place when the conclusion is legitimately deduced from a *universal* premise (major) *naturally known*, and from a *revealed particular* (minor) premise.

Here is an example illustrating the nature of a *theological conclusion*. Let us build a syllogism: A rational being is capable of knowledge (major). But man is a rational being (minor). Therefore man is capable of knowledge (conclusion). If we suppose that the major is naturally certain, but the *minor* revealed, we have a truly theological conclusion, because a new concept is contained in it: *capable of knowledge*, which is not contained in the revealed premise. But if we suppose that the major is revealed, but the minor naturally certain, we do not derive a truly theological conclusion, but a truth implicitly revealed in the major; because in the conclusion the capacity for knowledge of some rational being is affirmed, that is, about man, which was already affirmed in the *revealed major* about every rational being. Here is an example of a truly theological conclusion: Those things that are clearly identical cannot subsist separated (major naturally certain); but in the Eucharist the species of bread and wine subsist separated from

2. S. Th.: "God's existence and other similar things, which by natural reason can be known about God, are not articles of faith, but *preambles* to those articles: for in this way faith presupposes natural knowledge, just as grace presupposes nature" (I, q. 2, a. 2 ad 1). Hurter, I n.273-79.507.

their proper substance (revealed minor); therefore the species of bread and wine are not clearly identified with their proper substance (*theological conclusion*). These *properly said theological conclusions*, by this reason connected with revealed truths, are what in the strict sense are called *virtually revealed truths*.³

702. B. Dogmatic facts can be either *formally revealed*, like the divine institution of the Church, the resurrection of Christ, etc., or *necessarily connected with revealed truths*, that is, truths which if they are not held, revelation itself cannot be protected or proposed. We are speaking only about these, or about facts *connected with revelation*. But these are of two kinds: a) some are *simply such*, like the legitimacy of the Council of Trent, without which certitude about the dogmas defined by it would be called into doubt; b) but others are *doctrinal*, like the *orthodox* or *heterodox meaning* of a human text.

We are dealing especially with *doctrinal dogmatic facts*. In them a twofold question is wont to be distinguished: one of law and the other of fact. a) *A question of law*: namely, whether or not a human text considered in itself *objectively* manifests an orthodox or a heterodox meaning. b) *A question of fact*: whether or not in addition *the human author* with such a text *intended* to express a certain *meaning*. Hence a *dogmatic fact in the technical sense* is the orthodox or heterodox meaning, which the *human author, as an author*, intended to express with his text. In that, therefore, it is very necessary to pay attention to *the meaning of the author as such*.

The meaning of the author as author, a) is not the *merely subjective* meaning, which can be intended by the human author merely arbitrarily by some text; b) nor is it the *merely objective meaning*, which can signify several different things with the words taken in themselves materially; c) but it is the *objective-subjective* meaning, that is, what is expressed both by the obvious signification of the words and sentences, and it is concluded with certainty, from the circumstances in which the words were uttered or written down, that it is really *the meaning de facto intended by the author*.⁴

703. C. Dispositive decrees connected purposefully with revealed truths are universal laws enacted by the supreme authority of the Church in order to properly direct the life of the faithful to the end or purpose of the Church. These decrees are not divine laws, but ecclesiastical, which are said to be connected *purposefully* with revealed truths, because they are ordained for the purpose that the faithful may obtain supernatural salvation, according

3. See Wilmers, n.260-262.

4. Dieckmann, n.834-836.

to the manner established by God by his positive revelation. They concern *directly the power of ruling*; its real purpose is to establish, enforce and justify universal precepts; however, they do pertain *indirectly to the power of teaching*, inasmuch as they presuppose certain principles of doctrine, which cannot be subjected to error in the Church, which are, for example, a) that the Church has the power to prescribe all of them, b) that the observation of the universal precepts of the Church is in harmony with the doctrine of faith and morals and suitable for obtaining the end of the Church. These decrees are gathered together especially in the *Code of Canon Law*.

704. 1) *Disciplinary decrees in general* are: either a) *juridical*, which are ordained to determine, enforce and vindicate the rights and offices of the faithful; or b) *liturgical*, which are prescribed to order divine worship and the administration of holy things; or c) *magisterial*, which are disposed to promote ecclesiastical instruction and to moderate the preaching of evangelical doctrine.⁵

705. 2) *Canonizations of Saints* are definitive decrees of the universal ecclesiastical power, whereby the servants of God are solemnly declared to be saints, are added to the catalogue of saints and are proposed to the faithful of the whole Church to be honored and imitated. *Beatifications* of the servants of God are also decrees of the universal ecclesiastical power, but they do not obtain the supreme and definitive grade of that authority.⁶

706. 3) *Approvals of Religious Orders* are decrees of the supreme ecclesiastical authority, whereby the way of living according to a certain Rule is commended as apt to acquire perfection according to the evangelical counsels. Therefore, we are not considering here Religious groups with diocesan approval, or those approved by the authority of particular Bishops, but *Religious of Pontifical right*, and indeed those which have obtained from the Holy See not only a *decree of praise*, but also a *definitive approval*.⁷

707. State of the question. We hold that the object of infallibility, which is *secondary or indirect*, is all the truths that are connected necessarily with per se revealed truths, and they are: 1) *speculative truths* logically

5. Disciplinary decrees: a) Juridical: CIC 1-486, 1409-1998, 2142-2414 [1917]; b) Liturgical: CIC 726-1321 [1917]; c) Magisterial: CIC 1322-1408 [1917]. In the *Council of Trent* the liturgical decrees are: D 1198-1200, 1613, 1643-1644, 1645, 1656, 1728, 1732, 1744, 1746, 1755, 1757, 1821-1825.

6. CIC 1999-2141 [1917]; F. Spedalieri, *De Ecclesiae infallibilitate in Canoniz. Sanctorum* (1949).

7. CIC 487-681 [1917]; read especially CIC 487-488. 1.^o -3.^o; 593.

connected with revealed truths; 2) *dogmatic facts*, especially the doctrinal; 3) *disciplinary decrees* in general; 4) *solemn edicts of the canonization of Saints*; 5) *the definitive and supreme approval* of Religious Orders.

708. Adversaries. 1) *In general*, all who deny either revelation or infallibility are adversaries. These are especially *Rationalists* and *Naturalists*. *Protestants* also belong here, as was pointed out in the preceding thesis, n. 691.

2) *Against this thesis*, that is, on the secondary or indirect object of infallibility, those opposed are: a) *Semi-Rationalists*, like Günther and Frohschammer, who hold that philosophical truths are completely independent from any kind of doctrinal authority. See Pius IX, his Brief "*Eximiam tuam*": Letter "*Gravissimus inter*"; "*Syllabus*": D 2827, 2858-2861, 2903-2904, 2910-2914.

b) *Modernists*, who say that "the Church has no right to pass judgment on the assertions of human sciences": D 3405; and they teach that truth is changeable and relative, so that something can be true for a critic or philosopher which for a believer is an error and vice versa: D 3423, 3458, 3485.

c) *Jansenists*, who deny that doctrinal dogmatic facts understood in the technical sense fall under the authority of the Church: D 2012, 2390. *The Synod of Pistoia* refused to admit as definitive the disciplinary decrees of the Church connected with faith or morals, and said that such decrees can be harmful and lead one into error; they also repudiated the manner of living of Religious congregations definitively approved by the Supreme Pontiffs: D 2678, 2680-92.

d) *Contemporary lovers of novelties*, whose opinions Pius explained in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*," when he said: "Now Catholic theologians and philosophers... cannot afford to ignore or neglect these more or less erroneous opinions.... However it is apparent that there are some today who are desirous of *novelty*... and they try to withdraw themselves from the sacred Teaching Authority and are accordingly in danger of gradually departing from revealed truth." "Moreover, they assert that when Catholic doctrine has been reduced to this condition, a way will be found to satisfy modern needs, that will permit of dogma being expressed also by the concepts of modern philosophy, whether of *immanentism* or *idealism* or *existentialism* or any other system. Some more audacious affirm that this can and must be done, because they hold that the mysteries of faith are never expressed by truly adequate concepts but only by *approximate* and ever *changeable* notions, in which the truth is to some extent expressed, but is necessarily *distorted*. Wherefore they do not consider it absurd, buy

altogether necessary, that theology should substitute new concepts in place of the old ones in keeping with the various philosophies which in the course of time it uses as its instruments, so that it should give human expression to divine truths in various ways which are even somewhat *opposed*, but still *equivalent*, as they say.”⁸

709. Doctrine of the Church. Pius XII in the same place, on those desiring these novelties, says: “It is evident from what We have already said, that such undertakings not only lead to what they call dogmatic *Relativism*, but that they actually contain it....

“It is also manifest that the Church cannot be bound to every system of philosophy which has existed for a short space of time... For truth and its philosophic expression cannot change from day to day, least of all where there is question of self-evident principles of the human mind or of those propositions which are supported by the wisdom of the ages and by *divine revelation*... They seem to imply that any kind of philosophy can be reconciled with Catholic dogma. No Catholic can doubt how false this is, especially where there is question of those fictitious theories they call *Immanentism*, or *Idealism*, or *Materialism*, whether historic or dialectic, or even *Existentialism*, whether atheistic or simply the type that denies the validity of the reason in the field of metaphysics... the Teaching Authority of the Church by divine institution has the mission not only to guard and interpret the deposit of divinely revealed truth, but also to *keep watch over the philosophical sciences themselves*, in order that Catholic dogmas may suffer no harm because of erroneous opinions.” Hence he concludes: “We charge the Bishops and the Superiors General of Religious Orders, binding them most seriously in conscience, to take most diligent care that such opinions be not advanced in schools, in conferences or in writings of any kind and that they be not taught in any manner whatsoever to the clergy or faithful.”⁹

710. Vatican Council I proposes the doctrine of the thesis: 1) in its decrees; 2) in the definition of pontifical infallibility; 3) in the further definitions which it was preparing.

1. *From the Vatican decrees it is inferred* that our thesis *in general* is at least *theologically certain*, from the strongly affirmed obligation by the Council of adhering to the judgment approved by the Church concerning these truths connected with revealed truths: D 3018, 3042.

A theologian at Vatican I, P. Kleutgen, while making reference to this

8. AAS 42 (1950) 5623,564, 566. See n.735f.

9. AAS 42 (1950) 566,572,575,577.

doctrine of the Council, had this to say: "*It is defined in the Constitution on Faith* that it is the right and duty of the Church to pass judgment on the conclusions of Philosophy and of the other sciences."¹⁰

711. 2. *From the Vatican I definition of pontifical infallibility* it is inferred that our thesis is *theologically certain*, because the Council says that a Pontiff defining "a doctrine to be held possess the infallibility with which the Divine Redeemer willed his Church to be endowed": D 3074. For, the same *Secretary for the Faith*, when he explained this very point in the Council, said:

"Since *other* truths more or less strictly are connected with the revealed dogmas, which although *in themselves are not revealed*, still are required in order to fully protect the deposit of revelation itself, and so they must be correctly explained and efficaciously defined... Truths of this kind *of course do not look per se to the deposit of faith*, but they do concern the guarding of the deposit of faith. Hence all Catholic theologians agree that the Church in defining these truths is infallible. But the diversity of opinions is concerned primarily with the degree of certitude: that is, whether the infallibility involved in proposing these truths should be considered a *dogma of faith*, or *only theologically certain*... It was the unanimous consent of the Fathers on the Committee that this question at least for now should *not be defined, but should remain in the state in which it is*; so that it is defined about the object of the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff that the exact same thing is to be believed that is believed about the object of infallibility in the definitions of the Church... Therefore, in those cases in which *it is theologically certain*, but until now it is not certain that it is a matter of faith that the Church is infallible, also the infallibility of the Pontiff by this decree of the sacred Council *is not defined as something to be believed by faith*. But with this theological certitude it is certain that these other objects are included within the field of the infallibility with which the Church is endowed; with the same certitude it must also be held that infallibility in the definitions proclaimed by the Roman Pontiff extends also to these objects."¹¹

Hence from the Vatican definition of the pontifical infallibility it is concluded that it is a doctrine *at least theologically certain* that the object of infallibility is also the truths necessarily *connected* with revealed truths; the Fathers in the Council deduced this from the formula of the definition, in which the Council "outlines and determines by comparison with

10. J. Kleutgen, *Annotationes ad schema II de Ecclesia*: Msi 53,325.

11. V. Gasser, *loc.cit.*; Msi 52,1226f.

infallibility in the definitions of the Church" the object of infallibility,¹² and also because it retains the words *defines it to be held* (*tenendam definit*), contrary to those who wanted it to say *defines it to be held by divine faith* (*fide divina tenendam definit*); therefore the Council did not want to seem to restrict the ambit of infallibility *to per se revealed truths alone*: D 3074.¹³

712. 3) *In the decrees of Vatican Council I*, which had been prepared, the doctrine of the thesis was directly and explicitly defined; hence the thesis is proximate to a definition.

In Outline I cn.9: "If any one says that the infallibility of the Church is restricted only to those things which are contained *in divine revelation*, and does not also extend to other truths which *are required necessarily* in order to guard the whole deposit of revelation, let him be anathema."¹⁴

It gave its consent to the *revised Outline*, cn.9: "If any one says that the Church of Christ can fail in the true faith, or certainly is not immune from error in no other matters except in those which *per se* are contained in the word of God, let him be anathema."¹⁵

713. Theological note. The doctrine of the thesis is *at least theologically certain* and *proximate to a definition from the same Vatican Council I*.

714. Proof. *Truths certainly and necessarily connected with revealed truths are the object of infallibility.*

Note. Since we are saying that the Church is infallible in defining these truths, consequently we affirm that the Church can demand from the faithful *absolutely certain and irrevocable assent*, with which they hold these truths after the definition of the Church. However, we are saying nothing about the *quality* of this assent: that is, whether it is formally or virtually an assent of divine faith, immediate or mediated, elicited or commanded; or whether ecclesiastical or religious assent of faith suffices, as some authors maintain, or an assent of absolute "theological certitude," as the Secretary at the Vatican Council said.¹⁶ To determine this matter further pertains to the treatise On Faith.¹⁷

12. Msi 52,1226.1316.1317; Franzelin, *De Traditione* th.12 schol.1 princ.1 coroll.1-2.

13. Msi 51,701.702; 53,251.281.282; 52,3.7; 53,255-56.282-83; 53,275; 52,1241.1334. See J. Salaverri: *EstEcl* 22 (1948) 220-224.

14. Msi 51,543.552.

15. Msi 53,313.316.

16. Msi 52,1316-17; Hurter, *Theol.* 1 n.499; Palmieri, *De Ecclesia* § 40 n.5

17. Franzelin, *De Traditione* th.12 schol.1 princ.4 coroll.4; princ.7 coroll.3; Van Noort, *De Fide* n.246-50; Lennerz, *De virtut. theol.* (1930) 91; Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.67; Lercher, n.616; Vellico, *De Ecclesia* 425f; García, *Excmus.D.Fidelis: MiscCom* 6 (1946) 9-45.

715. It is proved with a general argument. What the purpose of the infallible Magisterium demands, and the infallible Church claims for herself—that truly belongs to the Church. But the purpose of the infallible Magisterium demands and the infallible Church claims for herself infallibility concerning truths connected with revealed truths, which we explained in the state of the question. Therefore infallibility concerning truths connected with revealed truths belongs to the Church.

The major. a) What the purpose of the infallible Magisterium demands belongs to the Church, because otherwise the power of the Magisterium would be non-existent, since it could not obtain its own end.

The major. b) What the infallible Church claims for herself really belongs to her, because in virtue of infallibility the Church necessarily must know and therefore does know the truths to which her infallibility extends, for otherwise the infallibility of the Church would be a power without a definite object concerning which it could be exercised, and therefore it could never be put into act: this is repugnant.

716. The minor. It will be proved part by part.

1) **Regarding speculative truths logically and necessarily connected with revealed truths.** A. *The end of the infallible Magisterium* demands infallibility concerning these truths. For, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands those things necessary to faithfully guard *the deposit of faith* and to declare it infallibly. But for this purpose infallibility is necessary concerning the truths logically and necessarily connected with revealed truths, which are *theological conclusions* and *the preambles of faith*. Therefore, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands infallibility concerning truths logically and necessarily connected with revealed truths.

The major is clear because the end of the infallible Magisterium is faithful custody of and infallible declaration of the deposit of faith: D 3020, 306y9-3070; see 1 Tim. 6:20.

The minor is certain, because if truths logically and necessarily connected with revealed truths, such as are the *preambles of faith* and *theological conclusions*, could be denied or called into doubt, logically and necessarily some revealed truth would have to be denied or called into doubt, as is clear from our terms. The preambles of faith are definable infallibly, not as preambles, but as connected with revealed truths.

717. B. The Church claims for herself infallibility concerning these connected truths. a) *Theoretically:* Pius IX, in 1872, in the Letter “*Gravissimas inter*” against Frohschammer, who incorrectly defended the

complete independence of Philosophy from faith: D 2858-2861. *Vatican Council I* vindicates the same point against the Rationalists and Semi-Rationalists: D 3018, 3042. Pius X defends the same rights of the Church against the Modernists in the Decree "*Lamentabili*"; D 3405, 3407, 3424. Finally, Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*," teaches openly that truths of this kind are an object of the Magisterium of the Church.¹⁸

b) *Practically*: *Lateran Council V*, in 1513, defined against the "rash philosophers" the main properties of the human soul, and in general said: "We define every statement contrary to the truth of the enlightened faith to be entirely false": D 1441; *Vatican Council I* repeated this definition: D 3017. Other practical decisions of the Church can be added, whereby she made a definitive judgment on philosophical propositions, as for example concerning the errors of Nicolas of Autrecourt: D 1028-1048.

718. 2) Regarding doctrinal dogmatic facts understood in the technical sense, for concerning the other dogmatic facts there is really no controversy.¹⁹

A. *The end of the infallible Magisterium* demands infallibility over these dogmatic facts. For, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands those things that are necessary to safely direct the faithful in the profession of the right faith and in the avoidance of contrary errors. But for this, infallibility is necessary in defining the orthodox or heterodox meaning of an author as the author of a dogmatic text. Therefore, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands infallibility concerning doctrinal dogmatic facts understood in the technical sense.

The major is clear, because the practical end of the Magisterium is to bring it about that the faithful avoid errors in faith, properly understand revelation and rightly profess the Catholic faith: see D 3020, 3018.

The minor is certain, because if the orthodox or heterodox meaning of a human text could not be defined infallibly, no one could be required peremptorily to profess a certain formula of faith, no one could be prevented efficaciously from admitting and spreading errors in faith, and finally there would be no completely safe way available to the Church to infuse and preserve the true faith in the minds of the faithful; for St. Thomas wisely says: "A man professes his faith by the words that he utters... and so inordinate words about matters of faith may lead to corruption of the faith."²⁰

18. AAS 42 (1950) 575. See above notes 8 and 9.

19. A. Gits, *La foi écclés. aux faits dogmatiques* (1940); J. Carreyre, *Jansénisme*: DTC 8,318-529.

20. S.Th. II-II, q. 11, a. 2 ad 2.

719. *The Church claims for herself infallibility over doctrinal dogmatic facts understood in the technical sense.* a) *Theoretically*, as is abundantly clear from the history of the condemnation of the five propositions of Jansen. Cornelius Jansen, who died in 1638, left the manuscript of a book entitled *Augustine*. This book was published in 1640 after the author's death, and shortly thereafter, in 1642, it was forbidden by Urban VIII. After many controversies over the doctrine contained in this book, Innocent X, in 1653, declared five propositions taken from this book of Jansen to be heretical: D 2001-2005.

The *Jansenists* protested against this, saying: those five propositions are indeed damnable, but they are not damned in the sense in which Jansen proposed them in his book; accordingly Alexander VII in 1656 proclaimed: "We declare and define that those five propositions were drawn from the book of the aforementioned Cornelius Jansen and that they have been condemned in the sense intended by the same Cornelius": D 2012. Since the *Jansenists* at the time did not want to abandon their error, the same Alexander VII, in 1665, ordered the Jansenists to sign a formula of submission with an oath: D 2020. The Jansenists still did not give in, so Innocent XII, in the years 1694 and 1696, declared that the formula of submission prescribed by Alexander VII should be understood by all *in its obvious meaning*, and at the same time once again confirmed the decrees against Jansenism authorized by Innocent X and Alexander VII: D 2020.

720. Then the *Jansenists* tried to avoid this condemnation by saying: one should not give internal assent to the condemnation of the propositions of Jansen, but only *obediential silence* (*obsequiosum silentium*). Wherefore finally Clement XI, in the year 1705, confirmed the decrees given by Innocent X and Alexander VII, and imposed the obligation of interiorly submitting to the condemnation of the five propositions of Jansen according to "the meaning which the words express": D 2390. Therefore, from this long process of sixty years it is patently clear that the Church claims for herself theoretically infallibility in condemning the five propositions of Jansen "in the sense in which they were intended by the author, which the words express": D 2012, 2390. Therefore, in this case the Church claims for herself infallibility over doctrinal dogmatic facts understood in the technical sense.²¹

21. See *Bullarium Rom.* 21,234f. Dieckmann, n.836-39; Schultes, a.35; D. de Becdelievre: DAFC 2,1153-92.

*See below n.1230-35; Hurter, *Theol.* 1 n.279.

721. b) Practically the Church always claims for herself infallibility over the same dogmatic facts and definitively condemns *some writings and their authors*. Thus, for example, the *Council of Constantinople II*, in 553, condemned “the impious Theodore (died in 428) and his impious writings”: D 435. Innocent II, in 1140, declared concerning Peter Abelard who died in 1142: “We have condemned the chapters and all the teachings of this Peter (Abelard) with their author, and we have imposed on him as a heretic perpetual silence”: D 721 [#387 in 34th ed.].

The *Council of Constance*, in 1418, concerning John Wycliffe, who died in 1384, and John Hus, who died in 1415, proposed to the Wycliffites and Hussites this seventh question: “whether he believes that the condemnations of John Wycliffe and John Hus made concerning their persons, books and documents have been duly and justly made and that they must be considered and firmly declared as such by every Catholic whatsoever”; and the eighth: “whether he believes, holds and declares that John Wycliffe and John Hus... were heretics and are to be considered and classed as heretics and that their books and doctrines have been and are perverse”: D 1249f.

Pius XI, in 1861, judged concerning the heterodox meaning of the published works of Jacob Frohschammer, who died in 1839; he decreed that the opinions, which Frohschammer asserted, are wholly foreign to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and that they are to be rejected, reprobated and entirely condemned: D 2851-2852, 2856-2857, 2860. Leo XIII, in 1887, “approved, confirmed and commanded to be observed by all” the decree of the *Holy Office*, whereby it judged that the propositions of Antonio Rosmini “in the author’s own sense are to be rejected and proscribed”: D 3241.

722. 3) Regarding disciplinary decrees in general, which are purposefully connected with revealed truths. A. *The end of the infallible Magisterium* demands infallibility concerning decrees of this kind. For, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands those things that are necessary in order to obtain the end for the life of the faithful in the Church without error. But in order to obtain the end for the life of the faithful in the Church without error, infallibility concerning the disciplinary decrees purposefully connected with the truths of revelation is necessary. Therefore, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands infallibility concerning the disciplinary decrees in general, which are purposefully connected with revealed truths.

The major is clear, because the end of the infallible Magisterium

finally must be ordained to this—that the faithful are directed without error in attaining the end of the Church.

The minor is certain from the definition itself of the disciplinary decrees in general, which are connected purposefully and necessarily with revealed truths, n.703.

723. B. *The Church claims for herself infallibility concerning these decrees.*

a) Concerning disciplinary decrees *in general*, what we said above is certain from Pius VI in the *Constitution "Auctorum fidei,"* in 1794, whereby he condemned the errors of the Synod of *Pistoia*: D 2678.

b) *In particular*, concerning *liturgical decrees*, that the Church claims for herself infallibility is certain from the law of Eucharistic Communion under just one species, which was solemnly mandated by the Councils of *Constance* and *Trent*: D 1200, 1258, 1728-1732. The same point can be abundantly confirmed from other decrees, by which the *Council of Trent* solemnly confirmed the rites and ceremonies, which must be used in the administration of the Sacraments and in the celebration of Masses: D 1613, 1645, 1657, 1745, 1746, 1757.

724. 4) Regarding decrees of the solemn Canonization of Saints.^a

A. *The end of the infallible Magisterium* demands infallibility concerning these decrees. For, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands those things that are necessary in order to direct the faithful without error to salvation through the correct worship and imitation of the examples of Christian virtues. But for such a purpose infallibility concerning decrees on the Canonization of Saints is necessary. Therefore, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands infallibility concerning decrees of the solemn Canonization of Saints.

The major is clear from the known power of the Church of sanctifying, to which other powers of the same Church are immediately ordained.

The minor is certain, because by the *solemn* decrees of the Canonization of Saints the Church not only tolerates and permits, but also *commends and instructs the whole flock of the faithful* that certain *definite* Saints whom it canonizes are to be honored, and it proposes them as examples of virtue who are worthy of imitation. But the mere possibility of error in such a solemn declaration would take away all confidence from the faithful and fundamentally would destroy the whole cult of the Saints; because it could happen that the Church would *solemnly* propose to all and mandate that condemned and evil men *perpetually* should be honored

and imitated. Therefore, in order to direct the faithful without error to salvation through correct worship and imitation of the examples of Christian virtues, infallibility is necessary concerning the solemn decrees of the Canonization of Saints.

725. B. *The Church claims for herself infallibility concerning the solemn decrees of the Canonization of Saints.* For, the Church in a practical manner claims for herself infallibility concerning the decrees which *she defines with a solemn judgment*. But the Church with a solemn judgment defines the decrees of the Canonization of Saints.

The major is clear, because a solemn judgment is the most proper form for an infallible definition, as we know from *Vatican Council I: D 3011* and from *CIC 1323 § 2 [1917]*.

The minor can be proved from the formulas, by which the decrees of Canonization are expressed. For example, Benedict XIII, in 1726, decreed:

“For the honor of the holy and undivided Trinity, the exaltation of the Catholic faith and the increase of the Christian name, by the authority of almighty God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and of Our own, with the advice and unanimous consent of Our venerable brothers the Eminent Cardinals...we have defined the Blessed John of the Cross is a Saint. We have decreed that he be added to the list of Holy Confessors who are not Bishops and we have mandated and do mandate that the same man be honored as a Saint by all Christ’s faithful... and this by the whole Church.” With the same formula, in the same year, the same Pontiff canonized also Saints Aloysius Gonzaga and Stanislaus Kostka.²²

The words Pius XII is wont to use in our time agree with this formula, as for example on June 22, 1947: “For the honor of the Holy and Undivided Trinity, for the exaltation of the Catholic Faith and the increase of the Christian Religion, by the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul and Our own, after mature deliberation and having often beseeched the divine assistance, and with the advice of Our Venerable Brothers, the Eminent Cardinals, we decree and define that the Blessed John de Britto, Martyr, Joseph Cafasso and Bernardine Realino, Confessors, are Saints and we are adding them to the Catalogue of the Saints; we also decree that their memory should be recalled with pious devotion by the whole Church. In the name of the

22. Benedict XIII: *Bullar. Roman.* Ed. Taurinen. 22 (1871) 482.486.489.

Fa † ther and of the S † on and of the Holy † Spirit. Amen.”²³

Several times the Pontiffs have declared with express words that this judgment is infallible. For example, Pius XI: “Having implored the divine light again and with great fervor, We, as the supreme Teacher of the Catholic Church pronounce an *infallible* judgment with these words: *For the honor* etc.” And elsewhere: “We, from the Chair of the Blessed Peter, as the supreme Teacher of the whole Church of Christ, solemnly proclaim with these words an *infallible* judgment: *For the honor* etc.” Also Pius XII: “We the universal Teacher of the Catholic Church, from the one Chair founded on Peter by the word of the Lord, have solemnly pronounced with these words this judgment, knowing that it cannot be wrong: *For the honor* etc.” And elsewhere: “We... sitting on the Chair, while performing the permanent Magisterium of Peter, have pronounced solemnly: *For the honor* etc.”²⁴

726. *On the grade of certitude* with which it must be held that the Church is infallible in the Canonization of Saints, it is necessary to cite the opinions of the eminent authors. St. Thomas said: “The Canonization of Saints is the middle between these two (namely between the things that pertain to faith and those pertaining to particular facts): because the honor, which we show to the Saints, is a certain profession of faith, by which we believe in the glory of the Saints, and by which it is *piously believed* that even in these matters the judgment of the Church cannot be in error.”²⁵

Fr. Suarez: “Even though it is not a matter of faith, I think it is *sufficiently certain*, and that the contrary is impious and temerarious.”²⁶

Benedict XIV mentions that a few older authors denied the infallibility of the Church concerning the decrees of Canonization. However, he defends the common opinion: “If it is not heretical, still it is *temerarious*, bringing scandal to the whole Church, ... *smacking of heresy*... *affirming an erroneous proposition*...we will say this about anyone who dares to assert that the Pontiff erred in this or that Canonization, that this or that Saint canonized by him is not to be honored with the worship of *dulia*.”²⁷

Now all hold that this doctrine is at least *theologically certain*. Indeed, according to the manifest mind of Pius XI and XII it can be said to be *implicitly defined*.

23. Pius XII: AAS 39 (1947) 209.249.281.329.377.

24. Pius XI: AAS 25 (1933) 425-426; 26 (1934) 539f.; Pius XII: AAS 33 (1941) 105; 41 (1949) 137.

25. S.Th., *Quodl.* 9, a. 16.

26. Suarez, *De Fide* d.5 s.8 n.8.

27. Benedict XIV, *De Canoniz. Sanctorum* l.1 c.43 n.28. See Dieckmann, n.851f.; F. Spedalieri, *De Ecclesiae infallibilitate in Canoniz. Sanctorum* (1949).

727. 5) Decrees of the definitive approval of Religious Orders.

A. *The end of the infallible Magisterium* demands infallibility concerning these decrees. For, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands those things that are necessary to direct the faithful without error to salvation through the way of evangelical perfection. But for this purpose infallibility is necessary concerning decrees definitively approving the Orders of Religious. Therefore, the end of the infallible Magisterium demands infallibility concerning pontifical decrees definitively approving the Orders of Religious.

The major is clear, because to direct the faithful to salvation through the way of evangelical perfection is one of the principal *matters of morals*, to which in general the infallibility of the Magisterium includes.

The minor is certain also, because pontifical decrees *definitively* approving Orders of Religious propose to the *whole* Church a *stable* way of living according to a Rule as a *certain* way of obtaining evangelical perfection. But in virtue of her infallibility in matters of morals, it is repugnant that the Supreme Pontiff would *definitively* propose for the *whole* Church a *stable* way of living as a *certain* way to perfection, which would be unsuited to or contrary to evangelical perfection.

728. Please note that in this argument the concern is with a *doctrinal* judgment, whereby it is decreed: that such a way of living, looked at in itself, is suitable for acquiring evangelical perfection, and that this judgment cannot be wrong. It is not a question of a *prudential* judgment, concerning the opportunity or convenience, because of the extrinsic circumstances of admitting or permitting some Religious Order; but a judgment like this perhaps is not necessarily infallible.²⁸

729. B. *The Church claims for herself* infallibility concerning decrees definitively approving Orders of Religious. a) This is certain from Pius VI, who in the *Constitution "Auctorem fidei,"* condemned the ruinous system of Religious Orders proposed by the *Synod of Pistoia*, precisely because the Religious Orders had been approved by the authority of the Holy See and of the Councils: D 2682, 2692. Finally, Pius IX in the Encyclical "*Quanta cura*" confirmed this condemnation against *Naturalism*: D 1692 [34th ed.].

b) *That the Church in a practical manner claims for herself* infallibility

28. M. Cano, *De locis* 1.5 c.5 ad 4: Some say that he is speaking about this prudential judgment, when he writes: "To approve or reject Orders, since it depends not on knowledge alone, but also on prudence, does not pertain to those things in which the Supreme Pontiff cannot err." See De Groot, q.9 a.9. But Suarez accuses Melchior Cano of error in this matter: *De Fide* d.5 s.8 n.9.

in decrees of this kind is clear from the solemn judgment with which the Orders of Religious are approved. Thus, for example, Paul V in 1606:

“By my own initiative,” he said, “and from Our certain knowledge and full deliberation, and with the fullness of Apostolic Power, we approve and confirm perpetually the laudable Institute and Constitutions of the said Society, and we add to it the strength of Our own Authority and that of the Apostolic See.” Similarly, another eight Supreme Pontiffs have approved the same Society. But this solemn judgment is the proper form of infallible decrees.²⁹

730. Objections.³⁰ The principles *of reason* and their conclusions, since they precede faith and are presupposed by faith, cannot be subjected to the judgment of faith, and therefore they cannot be infallibly defined. But the principles and conclusions of the sciences are of this kind. Therefore the principles and conclusions of the sciences cannot be infallibly defined.

I distinguish the major: Principles and conclusions that have no connection with matters of faith and morals, *conceded*; that have such a connection and indeed a necessary one, *I subdistinguish*: cannot be subjected to the judgment of faith by which they are perfected, *denied*, because grace perfects nature; they cannot be subjected to the judgment of faith by which they are corrected or annulled, *again I subdistinguish*: inasmuch as they are genuine principles and legitimate conclusions they cannot be corrected or annulled by the judgment of faith, *conceded*; inasmuch as, because of human limitation and fragility, they fall short of such genuineness and legitimacy, they cannot be corrected or annulled by the judgment of faith, *denied*. *I concede the minor; also I distinguish the consequence and deny the consequent.*³¹

731. 2. Without the freedom of investigation there is no true science. But an infallible judgment on the principles and conclusions of the sciences takes away the freedom of investigation. Therefore an infallible judgment on the principles and conclusions of the sciences destroys true science.

I distinguish the major. Without the *freedom* to investigate the proper principles of science and to deduce, according to a suitable method, the legitimate conclusions of the same science, there is no true science,

29. *Constitutiones Soc. Iesu* (Rome 1937) p.XXXIV-VIII. The authority of the decrees by which the Orders are approved is defended against Gulielmus A Santo Amore by St. Thomas, *Opusculum, Contra impugnantes Dei cultum et religionem* part2 c.21: ed. Vivès (Paris) 29 p.30; and St. Bonaventure, *De perfectione evangelica* q.2 a.2: ed. Quaracchi, 2 p. 153.

30. See De San, n.261.277; De Groot, q.9 a.2-6; Dieckmann, n.851.

31. S.Th., *In Boetium de Trin.* q.2, a. 3.

conceded; without the *license* to adopt false or erroneous principles and to deduce from them also false or erroneous conclusions, there is no true science, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor*. An infallible judgment on the principles and conclusions of the sciences, which are connected with dogma, takes away the freedom to adopt false and erroneous principles, as contrary to the principles of faith, and to deduce conclusions which from the light of faith it is certain are erroneous and false, *conceded*; it takes away *true freedom* to use certain principles and to deduce legitimate conclusions of science, *denied* (D 2858f.).

At least whatever subordinates scientific investigation to preconceived ideas is "a hindrance or progress and an obstacle to science." But infallible definitions in the matters of the sciences subordinate scientific investigation to preconceived ideas. Therefore infallible definitions in matters of the sciences "are a hindrance of progress and an obstacle to science."³²

I distinguish the major. If such ideas are false and erroneous, *conceded*; if such ideas are true, certain and protected against errors, *I subdistinguish*: if these ideas are perhaps conflicting or foreign to the proper object of the science, *conceded*; if, on the contrary, they lead to a more perfect and error-free attaining the proper object of the science, as all those really are that are said to be *connected*, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequence and the consequent*.

732. 3. Infallibility concerning per se revealed truths suffices in order to guard and declare the whole deposit of faith. Therefore infallibility concerning truths connected with revealed truths is not necessary.

I distinguish the antecedent. To guard and declare objectively the whole deposit of faith, *I bypass the antecedent*; to truly guard and efficaciously declare the whole deposit of faith in the minds of the faithful so that it is correctly understood by them, infallibility concerning per se revealed truths is sufficient, *denied*.

733. 4. To truly guard and efficaciously declare the deposit of faith in the minds of the faithful, a fully authentic Magisterium concerning truths connected with revealed truths is sufficient. Therefore infallibility is not required for these.

I deny the assumption: that is, that the Magisterium is distinguished into authentic and infallible, depending on the object. This distinction is taken from the grade of authority, by which it is exercised, and from the corresponding grade of firmness of adhesion, which it imposes on the

32. See Pius II, Encyclical "*Humani generis*": AAS 42 (1950) 567.

faithful. Therefore if the objector concedes that truths connected with revealed truths are the object of the authentic Magisterium, by that very fact he cannot deny that they are also the object of the infallible Magisterium.

Or, *I distinguish the antecedent*. Generally and in ordinary circumstances, *I bypass that point*; always and in every case, *I subdistinguish*: it suffices to obtain obediential silence and merely conditioned assent, *I bypass that*; to require the internal and absolute assent of the mind, *denied*.

734. 5. The argument taken from the fact that the Church claims for herself infallibility over virtually revealed truths supposes as already known that the infallibility of the Church is extended to virtually revealed truths. But assumed truth of this kind is also virtually revealed. Therefore such an argument supposes what is to be proved.

a) Some theologians like Zapelena respond: *The minor is denied*, because that the infallibility of the Church is extended to the virtually revealed is a truth that is formally or at least implicitly revealed in the dogma about infallibility itself and its end, from which by analysis it can be deduced.³³

b) *I distinguish the major*. It supposes as already known *by the Church* that its infallibility extends to virtually revealed truths, *conceded*; it supposes as already known *by the demonstrating theologian* that the infallibility of the Church extends to virtually revealed truths, *denied*. *I bypass the minor and distinguish the consequent*. Such an argument would suppose what is to be proved, if it supposed as already known *to the theologian*, who argues, that the infallibility of the Church extends to virtually revealed truths, *conceded*; if he supposes what is already known *by the Church*, *denied*.

735. 6. *Theological conclusions* in the proper sense, or which are truly deduced from a universal naturally known truth and from a particular revealed truth, are not really connected with revealed truths. Therefore they cannot be the object of infallibility.

I prove the antecedent. A true connection supposes that the concepts of supernatural revelation are identified with concepts of natural reason. But this identity is impossible. Therefore theological conclusions are not truly connected with revealed truths, that is, in the proper sense there cannot be any theological conclusion.

I prove the major with one example: The Word proceeds through the intellect (universal naturally known principle). But the Son of God is the

33. See Zapelena, 2 (1940) th.18 obj.3 p. 105.

Word (particular revealed truth). Therefore the Son proceeds from the Father through the intellect (a theological conclusion in the proper sense).

For this conclusion to be truly connected with revealed truth, or for it to be a true theological conclusion, it is necessary to suppose that the concept of *word* of the major premise is identified with the concept of *Word* of the minor premise, for otherwise the syllogism would have four terms. But the concept of *word of natural reason* cannot be identified with the concept of *Word of supernatural revelation*. Therefore there is no conclusion, because always syllogisms of this kind can be distinguished in this way: the word in created persons proceeds by the intellect, *conceded*; the Word in God proceeds by the intellect, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor*. The Son of God is a created Word, *denied*; divine, *conceded*. And based on these distinctions *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.³⁴

I respond by distinguishing the proof of the antecedent. A true connection supposes that the concepts of revelation and reason are necessarily identified univocally, *denied*; at least analogically, *I subdistinguish*: with a true analogy and one based on revelation, *conceded*; with an analogy that is not true nor based on revelation, *denied*.

I explain: The concepts of the *word* used in the example are indeed identified in the *major* and *minor* premises, however not univocally, but analogically and surely with a true analogy and one based on revelation. But this is sufficient in order to give a true conclusion. For, God *revealing* said *to men* that his Son is the Word (John 1:14). Therefore, as a prudent speaker he intends that men will understand that the notion of the word known to them is truly and properly verified by his Son, although freed from all imperfections and limits with which it is verified in created things. Hence in the given example, the syllogism truly and properly concludes in this way: It is of the transcendental nature of the word known by the human intellect to proceed by the intellect. But God, as a prudent speaker, adapting himself to the human intellect, revealed to men that his Son is the Word. Therefore, the transcendent nature of procession by the intellect truly belongs to the Son of God, although not in a finite but in an infinite way.

736. 7. Theological conclusions have a merely relative value and are subject to evolution. But propositions of this kind cannot be defined

34. The argumentation seems to be able to be reduced especially to this as the one by which L. Charlier is moved to deny the possibility of theological conclusions, *Essai sur le problème théologique* (1938). See the prohibition of the *Holy Office* and the author's submission: AAS 34 (1941) 37,148. See Stegmüller-Koster: ThRev 38 (1939) 41-51; R. Gagnebet: RevThom 45 (1939) 108-145; Zapelena: Greg 24 (1941) 23-47, 287-326; 25 (1944) 38-73, 247-282; M. Labourdette, *La Théologie et ses sources*: RevThom 46 (1946) 5-44. On this matter read the warning of Pius XII in *Allocutione ad Patres O.P.*: AAS 38 (1946) 387f. For n.735f., see Pius XII encyclical "*Humani generis*": AAS 42 (1950) 561-578.

infallibly by the Church. Therefore theological conclusions are not the object of infallibility.

I prove the major. Theological conclusions depend on the value of a human philosophical system and on a certain level of the evolution of science. But these are purely relative and subject to evolution. Therefore also theological conclusions.

They show the *purely relative value* of theological conclusions, for example, by the distinction of the syllogism previously given about the procession of the Word, in this way: the word proceeds by the intellect according to the system of Scholastic Philosophy and within a certain level of the evolution of theological knowledge, *conceded*; according to every possible philosophical system and within every possible level of evolution of theological knowledge, *denied*. *I concede the minor and also distinguish the consequent.*³⁵

Response. I distinguish the major. Theological conclusions have relative value and are subject to evolution, inasmuch as, although really not comprehensively but inadequately they propose revealed truths and so constantly can be perfected, *conceded*; inasmuch as falsely or erroneously they propose revealed truths and so constantly must be corrected objectively, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor:* Propositions that have relative value and are subject to evolution cannot be defined infallibly by the Church, if they propose falsely or erroneously revealed truths and so must be corrected objectively, *conceded*; if truly, although not comprehensively but inadequately they propose revealed truths and so constantly are subject to further perfection, *denied*.

This solution is based on absolutely certain principles, by which, while the objective immutability of the deposit of revelation remains, still progress in its understanding, explanation and proclaiming can be had in a stable manner. See n.754-761.

737. 8. Theological conclusions defined infallibly must be held with the assent of faith. But as not formally revealed, theological conclusions cannot be held with the assent of faith. Therefore they cannot be defined infallibly.

I distinguish the major. Conclusions infallibly defined must be held

35. The argumentation of the authors of this objection seems to be able to be reduced above all to this: J. Danielou, *Les orientations presents de la pensée religieuse*: Et April 1946; Br. De Solages, *Pour l'honneur de la Théologie*: BullLittEcccl 48 (1947) 3-17, 65-84; N.N., *La Théologie et ses sources*: RechScRel 33 (1946) 353-371; 47 (1947) 5-19; Garrigou-Lagrange, *La nouvelle Théologie où va-t-elle*": Ang 23 (1946) 126-145; 24 (1947) 124-133, 210-214; A. Perego, *La Teologia nueva*: CyF 5 (1949) 7-30. On this matter read the warning of Pius XII in *Allocutione ad Patres S.I.*: AAS 38 (1946) 384f.

with an assent that is absolutely certain, *conceded*, for this is what the *impossibility of error* of an infallible judgment strictly demands; such assent must be said to be either theological, or of ecclesiastical faith, or of divine faith (immediate or mediated, formal or virtual), or elicited or commanded by divine faith, *I bypass this point*, because theologians debated about this in the treatise *On Faith*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*³⁶

36. See what we said in n.714 and in note 17. For the historical difficulties in the case of St. John Nepomucene, see P. David, *Bohême*: DHGE 444f.; Dieckmann, n.852f.; Zapelena, 2 (1954) 249-52. See J.V. Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.107 p.114; EncCat 6,574-576; P. de Vooght, *Iéan dé Pornuk*: RevHistEccl 48 (1953) 777-795.

CHAPTER IV

On the sources of the Magisterium of the Church

ARTICLE I

ON THE DEPOSIT OF FAITH

Thesis 18. Revelation, constituting the object of Catholic faith, was completed with the Apostles (D 2021).

738. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 7; a. 10 ad 2; q. 174, a. 6; Suarez, *De Fide* l.1 c.18; Franzelin, *De Tradit.* Th.22; Wilmers, *De Religione* th.122-124; De Groot, q.8 a.2; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* th.13; Muncunill, *De locis* n.128-136; Schultes, a.69; Dieckmann, th.30; Dorsch, p.760-64; De Guibert, th.44; Lercher, n.515; Cotter, th. 37; Al-Bárcena, th.15; R. Spiazzi, *Rivelazione compiuta con la morte degli Apostoli: Lo sviluppo del Dogma* (1953) p.24-57.

739. From the treatise *On Christ the Divine Legate* it is certain that Christ was sent to preach some revelation, which all men must embrace. In the treatise *On the Ecclesiastical Magisterium* it was demonstrated that Christ instituted in the Church an infallible Magisterium in order to reverently guard and faithfully declare his divine revelation. Now there are two further questions to be answered: 1) When was this divine revelation completed? 2) Where is it to be found? This thesis answers the first question.

740. **Definition of terms.** *Revelation* is attesting speech, whereby God manifested truths to men. In it a twofold main aspect is usually distinguished—one formal and the other objective. a) *Revelation formally* is the attesting speech of God itself, b) *Objective revelation* consists in the truths made known to men by God by means of an attesting speech.

Revelation according to its destination again is distinguished into two forms: a) *Private Revelation* is that which is given to a private person and for his good, b) *Public Revelation* is that which is imposed by God on society and must be embraced for the good of its members. This public revelation is divided again into particular and universal: α) *Particular* is the public revelation, which is destined for a particular people, like the revelation of Moses in the Old Testament. β) *Universal* is the public revelation, which is given to all men of all peoples, like the Christian revelation of the New Testament.

741. *This Christian revelation* is said to have been *completed with the Apostles*. But this can be understood in three ways: a) Revelation would be completed *personally* with the Apostles, if all of it were given *immediately to the persons of the Apostles*. b) Revelation would be said to be completed *temporally* with the Apostles, if all of it were given *within the time* in which the Apostles lived on this earth, namely, until the death of the Apostle John. c) Revelation would be said to be completed with the Apostles *virtually*, if every revealed truth, although the revelation was given immediately to someone among the faithful, but had to be acknowledged as such by one of the Apostles.

742. State of the question. In the thesis we are treating *objective, public and universal* Revelation, and so we say: "Revelation constituting the object of Catholic faith." We are saying that it was *completed with the Apostles*, not necessarily personally, but at least *temporally and virtually*, so that after the death of St. John the Apostle there is then no more objective, public and universal divine revelation.

743. Adversaries. A. *In general* are all those who expect some new, objective and public revelation after the death of the Apostles. Such mentioned in antiquity are the *Montanists*: Kch 218 bis; in the middle ages the *Fraticelli*: D 915; after that there were some *Illuminists*, whom we dealt with in the thesis on the perpetuity of the Church, n.290-292.

B. *In particular there were the Rationalists and the Semi-Rationalists*, like Günther and Frohschammer, who hold that all truths even the most recondite can be discovered and developed by man by the work of natural reason, and so they deny that the deposit of revelation is closed: they say rather that it is "like a philosophical system, which can be perfected by human ingenuity": D 2777, 2827, 2856-2857, 2905, 3020.

C. There are also the *Modernists*, who pervert the very idea of revelation, and say that it is subject to radical evolution and continuous transformation: D 3420, 3421, 3454, 3493, 3541.

744. Doctrine of the Church. *The Council of Trent openly defined:*

"The Gospel, which Christ first promulgated from his own lips, he in turn ordered that it be preached through the Apostles to all creatures as the source of all saving truth and norms of conduct... this truth and rule are contained in the written books and unwritten traditions that have come down to us, having been received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself or from the Apostles by the dictation of the Holy Spirit and have been transmitted, as it were, from hand to hand": D 1501.

Vatican Council I sufficiently clearly vindicated our doctrine against the *Rationalists* and *Semi-rationalists*: D 3020, 3043, 3069-3070.

Pius IX especially condemned the doctrine of the *Semi-Rationalists* in the Encyclical "*Qui pluribus*," in the Brief "*Eximiam tuam*," in the Letter "*Gravissimas inter*," and the "*Syllabus*": D 2777, 2827, 2856-2857, 2905.

Pius X condemned the views of the *Modernists* in the decree "*Lamentabili*," the Encyclical "*Pascendi*," and in the "*Oath*" against Modernism: D 3420, 3421, 3454, 3493, 3541.

Pius XII, in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*," says: "To the Magisterium Christ the Lord confided the whole deposit of faith, namely, the Sacred Writings and divine Tradition to guard and to defend and to interpret": AAS 42 (1950) 567.569. Also in the Encyclical "*Ad Sinarum gentem*": AAS 47 (1955) 10-11.

745. Theological note. Our thesis can be said to be implicitly defined in the *Council of Trent* and *Vatican I*, in the places cited.

746. Proof. The economy of salvation instituted by Christ on the Apostles is definitive and complete. But in it, after the death of the Apostles, there is no expectation of any new revelation, which is the object of the Catholic faith. Therefore revelation, constituting the object of Catholic faith, was completed with the Apostles.

The major. This premise is clear 1) from the thesis on the perpetuity of the Church, in which it was proved that the economy of the Church instituted by Christ on the Apostles a) will exist perpetually until the end of the world; therefore it is definitive; b) and that it is necessary for all men so that in it and only through it can all be saved; therefore it is complete.¹

747. *The same major* is confirmed 2). Gal. 3:23-4:7 expressly contrasts the Mosaic economy with the Christian economy under the aspect we are now considering: for a) it teaches that the Mosaic economy of revelation was *merely preparatory*, as what was given by God to lead men, as a *pedagogue*, to Christ: Gal. 3:23-24; that it was *imperfect and incomplete*, because he says it was proper to *slavery and infancy*: Gal. 4:1-3. b) But on the other hand, he describes the economy of Christ's revelation as *perfect and complete* with freedom and sonship: Gal. 3:25-28; 4:4-6; and he shows the same as *definitive*, that is, ordained only to the eternal inheritance of God: Gal. 3:29; 4:7; Rom. 8:15-18. Therefore, according to St. Paul, the economy of revelation instituted by Christ on the Apostles is definitive and complete.²

1. See thesis 7, on the Church's perpetuity, n.298-305.

2. See. S.Th., *Comment. In epist. Ad Gal. 3:23—4:7*, lect.8-9 and 1-3; Cornely, *Cursus Scripturae*, commentary on this passage in the letter to the Galatians; Ceulmans, at this place.

748. The minor. Within the Christian economy, after the death of the Apostles, a new revelation is not to be expected which would be the object of Catholic faith, because Christ 1) *positively handed on to his Apostles the whole revelation of the Catholic faith*; 2) *he handed it on to them so exclusively that the successors of the Apostles would receive no new revelation*. Therefore, within the Christian economy, after the death of the Apostles, a new revelation of the Catholic faith is not to be expected.

I prove the antecedent. 1) *Positively*, Christ handed on to his Apostles the whole Catholic revelation: a) *Implicitly*, because, as was proved in thesis 2, Christ positively handed on his whole mission to his Apostles, of which the Catholic revelation, as is clear, is an essential part: John 17:18-20; 20:21; Matt. 28:18. b) *Explicitly*, because Christ whether by himself or by the Holy Spirit positively handed on to his Apostles his whole teaching and all revealed truth: John 14:24-26; 15:15; 16:12-15.

2) *Exclusively* Christ so handed on to his Apostles his complete revelation that their successors would receive no new revelation: because the *Apostles* were constituted by Christ as his *witnesses* of Christian revelation to all nations, not only *immediately*, but also *exclusively*; therefore their successors could not receive any new revelation.

749. A. It is certain from Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:8.22; 5:32; 120:37-43; 26:16; John 17:20 that the *Apostles* were constituted by Christ as the *immediate witnesses* of Christian revelation.

B. That the *Apostles* also were constituted by Christ as the *exclusive witnesses* of Christian revelation is proved by the fact that the successors of the Apostles are held to hand on as revealed only what they have received from the Apostles; this is inferred 1) *from the teaching of St. Paul* and 2) *from the conviction of the successors of the Apostles*.

750. From the teaching of St. Paul: a) Because St. Paul calls the tradition of the Apostles the *deposit*, which requires that it be faithfully guarded: 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:13-14; 2:2; 3:14; see R. 2173.

b) Because in Gal. 1:1-9, St. Paul says that the Gospel of Christ committed to the Apostles is one to such an extent that it necessarily supposes that all teaching that is not in agreement with the Gospel of the Apostles cannot be considered as revealed by Christ.

c) Because in Eph. 2:19-22 St. Paul deduces a conclusion from the teaching, which he expounded in chapters 1 and 2, from the mystery of the recapitulation of all things in Christ: Eph. 1:10; in this way God willed to unite Jews and Gentiles into one new man in Christ: Eph. 2:12-

16. Therefore, while explaining this mystery of unity to the Gentiles, he concludes: *So then you are no longer strangers and sojourners, but you are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone, in whom the whole structure is joined together and grows into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom you also are built into it for a dwelling place of God in the Spirit:* Eph. 2:19-21. Therefore according to St. Paul every Christian edifice is built *on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets*, which Christ as the cornerstone has united in himself. But this would not be true if the successors of the Apostles could hand on as revealed something that was not received from the Apostles. Therefore the successors of the Apostles are bound to hand on as revealed only what they have received from the Apostles.³

751. 2) *From the conviction of the successors of the Apostles* the same point is confirmed. For, they profess that they must faithfully guard and hand on to others as revealed only what they have received from the Apostles:

The *Didache*, towards the end of the first century, or before 150: "Guard what you have received, neither adding to it nor subtracting from it." But what these things are is shown by the title of the work: *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*: R 1f.

Clement of Rome, about the end of the first century: "The Apostles received the Gospel for us from the Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ was sent from God. Christ, therefore, is from God and the Apostles are from Christ. Both, accordingly, came in proper order by the will of God": R 20.⁴

Polycarp, about 110: "Let us abandon the vanities of the crowd and their false teachings; let us return to the word which was delivered to us from the beginning": R 74. But what this tradition may be that was handed on from the beginning is deduced from what Polycarp himself warns in the same letter: "When he [Paul] was absent, he wrote letters to you, and if you examine them carefully you will be strengthened in the faith, which was given to you": R 72.

Papias, about 130: "I asked for the accounts of our seniors: What did Andrew or Peter say? Or Philip or Thomas or James or John or Matthew, or any of the Lord's disciples?": R 94.

Justin, about 155: "As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and

3. Because of the context of chapters 1 and 2, from which Eph. 2:19-22 is like an immediate conclusion, we think that the almost unanimous interpretation of *the holy Fathers and exegetes* is to be preferred. They hold that the Prophets, whom St. Paul mentions in this place, are *the Prophets of the Old Testament*. Therefore from the context the interpretation of a few ancient authors seems to us to be excluded, like that of Tertullian and Pelagius, and a few more recent writers, like Cajetan and Knabenbauer, who think that St. Paul is speaking about the same charismatic Prophets of the New Testament, who are mentioned later in Eph. 4:11. See S.Th., *Comment. In epist. Ad Eph. 2:19-22*.

4. Please note how well this testimony of St. Clement agrees with the text of Tertullian which we quote below.

say is true... they then are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated,... they then receive the washing with water... The reason for this we have received from the Apostles": R 126.

752. *Irenaeus*, about 190: "It is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the Church; since the Apostles, like a rich man, like a rich man depositing his money [in a bank], lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth: so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers": R 213. "True knowledge (Γνώσις ἀληθής) is the doctrine of the Apostles... which has come to us, being guarded and preserved, without any forging of Scripture, by a very complete system of doctrine, and neither addition nor [suffering] curtailment [in the truths which she believes]; and [it consists in] reading [the Word of God] without falsification, and a lawful and diligent exposition in harmony with the Scriptures, both without danger and without blasphemy": R 242.

Tertullian, about 200: "If the Lord Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, no others ought to be received as preachers than those whom Christ appointed: for no man knows the Father save the Son, and to whomsoever the Son has revealed him (Matt. 11:27). Neither does the Son seem to have revealed Him to any other than to the Apostles, whom He sent to preach, that which He revealed to them... It is quite apparent that all doctrine... must be accounted true, as without doubt containing that which the Churches have received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God. And all other doctrine must be judged at once to be false, which savors things contrary to the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God... We have communion with the Apostolic Churches, because we have no doctrine differing from them. This is evidence of truth": R 293. "If these things be so, so that the truth be adjudged to belong to us as many as walk according to this rule, which the Churches have handed down from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God... To the heretics it may justly be said: Who are you? When and from where do you come? Not being mine, what do you in that which is mine?... Why do the rest of you sow and feed here at your own pleasure? It is my possession; I have held it of old; I held it first: I have a sure title down from the first owners themselves, whose the estate was. I am the heir of the Apostles. As they provided by their own testament, as they committed it in trust, as they have adjured, so I hold it. You, assuredly, they have ever disinherited and renounced, as aliens, as enemies": R 298.

Origen, about 230: "As the preaching of the Church, transmitted in orderly succession from the Apostles, and remaining in the churches to the present day, is still preserved, that alone is to be accepted as truth which differs in no respect from ecclesiastical and apostolic tradition": R 443.

753. *The testimonies of the later holy Fathers are abundant.* For example, the following can be consulted: *Athanasius*, about 359: R 785; *Gregory of Nyssa*, about 390: R 1043; *Epiphanius*, about 377: R 1107;

Chrysostom, about 391: R 1181; Augustine, about 400: R 1623; Vincent of Lérins, about 434: R 2173f.

Therefore the successors of the Apostles were convinced that they could hand on as revealed only those things which they had received from the Apostles.

754. Scholium 1. Dogmatic progress, even given the impossibility of increasing objective revelation, nevertheless can take place in various ways and does take place.

Schultes, *Introductio ad Historiam Dogmatum* (1922); Marín-Sola, *La evolución homogénea del Dogma católico* (1923); Pinard de la Boullaye, *Dogme*: DAFC 1 (1914) 1151-1184; E. Dublanchy, *Dogme*: DTC 4 (1920) 1606-1647; L. de Grandmaison, *Le dogme chrétien* (1928); Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.126-163; De Guibert, n.398-414; Dieckmann, n.815-822. See *Lo Sviluppo del Dogma secondo la Dottrina Cattolica*: Secunda settimana teologica nella Pont. Univ. Gregoriana (1953); M. Flick, *Il problema de lo sviluppo del Dogma nella Teologia contemporanea* p.5-23; R. Spiazzi, *Rivelazione compiuta con la morte degli Apostoli* p.24-57; G. Rambaldi, *Immutabilità del Dogma e delle formule dogmatiche* p. 58-84; A. Bea, *Il progresso nell'interpretazione della Sacra Scrittura* p.85-105; C. Balic, *Il senso Cristiano e il progresso del Dogma* p.106-134; G. Filograssi, *Tradizione divino-apostolica e Magistero* p. 135-167; E. Dhanis, *Révélation explicite et implicite* p.168-218; C. Boyer, *Relazione tra il progresso filosofico, teologico, dogmatico* p.219-233: See also in Greg 33 (1952) 5-182.

755. *Dogmatic progress in general* can be defined as an increase in dogma through successive growth.

Dogma in the strict sense is a revealed truth and it is proposed by the Church to all to be believed: D 3011. Therefore, *three elements* enter into the notion of dogma: *the first is objective*, which is the revealed truth; *the other two are subjective*; one is *active*, which is the Magisterium of the Church proposing it; but the third is more *passive*, which is the faithful embracing the proposed truth with divine faith.

756. Hence *objective dogmatic progress* would be an increase through successive growth of divine truths. Such objective progress surely has taken place, as St. Paul clearly teaches: Heb. 1:1. St. Thomas distinguishes a threefold stage of this progress: before the Mosaic Law, under the Law given by Moses, and finally in the time of grace.⁵

This *objective progress* after the death of the Apostles cannot happen,

5. S.Th. I, q. 57, a. 5 ad 3; II-II, q. 174, a. 6; St. Gregory I: R 2329.

because, as we have proved, revelation was completed with the death of the Apostles: D 3421.

But subjective progress can take place unceasingly and historically has done so, on the part of a twofold subjective element, which enters into the notion of dogma: 1) *on the part of the proposition of the Magisterium of the Church*; 2) *on the part of the understanding of the members of the Church*: D 3020.⁶

757. 1) Vincent of Lérins explains very well *the progress in the proposition of the Magisterium*: R 2173, and it is wont to take place in three ways: a) When the Magisterium *declares that a truth is really revealed*; thus doubt about the fact is removed and certitude is increased, as happened in the definition of the mystery of the Immaculate Conception and of the Assumption of the Bl. Virgin Mary: n.696; D 2803-2804. b) When the Magisterium *declares the meaning of a text of Scripture* or of a proposition already contained in the confession of the Church, as happened, for example, in the *Council of Trent* and *Vatican I*: D 1532, 3007. c) When a doubtless revealed truth, and one recognized as such, is expressed and defined with more suitable and *authentic formulas* by the Magisterium, as happened with the dogma of the divinity of Christ, of the procession of the Holy Spirit, and with the mystery of the conversion of bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ: D 125-126, 1300-1302, 1642.

758. 2) Vincent of Lérins explains very well *the progress in the understanding* of the members of the Church: R 2174 and it is wont to happen in three ways: a) *From the analysis, comparison and synthesis* of revealed truths between themselves and with naturally certain truths, as *Vatican Council I* clearly said: D 3016. b) *From the deduction of truths necessarily connected* with revealed truths, like theological conclusions in the strict sense, to which can be added a grade of absolute certitude from an infallible definition of the Magisterium, as is concluded from the doctrine on the indirect object of infallibility.⁷ c) *From the clearly certain opposition to errors* that are contrary to revealed truths, as *Vatican Council I* warned: D 3018.⁸

759. *The main cause of dogmatic progress* is, without doubt, *the authentic and infallible Magisterium of the Church*, which was divinely

6. "Each source of divinely revealed doctrine contains so many rich treasures of truth, that they really can never be exhausted" (Pius XII, "*Humani generis*": AAS 42,568).

7. See S.Th., I, q. 32, a. 4.

8. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 10.

instituted for the purpose to guard the deposit of revelation, to defend it against the attacks of errors, to free it from shadows of doubt by an authentic declaration, to adapt it and explain it so the faithful can understand it, to reconcile it with the progress of truth of various sciences, and so forth.

But a subsidiary cause of the same progress is the *knowledge of Theologians* especially and of other persons who are experts in the various ecclesiastical disciplines, as is abundantly certain from the history of the Councils and of all the ecclesiastical disciplines. This was already pointed out by Origen: R 444; more recently Pius IX mentioned this: D 3666-3667; and finally, Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*": AAS 42,568f.

760. But the *occasions* presenting the opportunity and stirring men to make dogmatic progress are mainly these: a) *Errors and heresies*, which constantly arise; because of them the dogmas of the Christian religion are more carefully investigated, more clearly proposed, more firmly proved, better distinguished from the doctrine of men, and finally are more fully explained: Kch 744, R 1765 (St. Augustine).

b) *The religious life and liturgical praxis of the faithful*, according to the maxim of Celestine I: "the rule or prayer determines the rule of belief": D 246, which Pius XI also mentions: D 2200 [34th ed.]. But this maxim, as Pius XII *authentically* declared, is to be understood in the sense that the Liturgy "is a continued profession of the Catholic faith and publicly testifies to the faith of the Church, and so it supplies arguments and testimonies for the Magisterium of the Church." And therefore the Liturgy is not to be considered as a proper source or experimental criterion of the truth of the dogmas of the faith, but rather it must be subject to the truths of the faith; because "the Liturgy of the Church does not generate the Catholic faith, but rather it follow it," according to this principle: *The rule of prayer determines the rule of belief*.⁹

c) *The praxis and experience of the life of the Church*, which contributes especially to obtaining progress in the doctrine of morals, according to the admonition of St. Augustine: R 1623.

761. d) Finally, *private revelations*, although they do not pertain to the deposit of divine and Catholic faith, and so strictly speaking cannot become dogmas, nevertheless they can contribute to the promotion of the religious life and they can be a help to investigate better and to understand Christian revelation, especially if the Church recognizes them as historically certain. Still sometimes the Church acknowledges them prudently *with historical faith alone*, inasmuch as they contain nothing contrary to faith and morals. If at times the Church cites private revelations in order to institute some new feasts,

9. Pius XII, Encyclical "*Mediator Dei*": AAS 39 (1947) 540f.; *Const. Apost. "Munificentissimus Deus"*: AAS 42 (1950) 758.760; Pius IX, Bull "*Ineffabilis Deus*": Acts of Pius IX, 1,601; Pius XI, "*Quas primas*": AAS 17 (1925) 598. See W. de Vries, *Lex supplicandi, lex credendi*: Eph.Litur 47 (1933) 48-58; A. Eguluz, *Lex orandi, lex credendi*: VerVid 6 (1948) 45-67; H.A.P. Schmidt, *Lex orandi, lex credendi, in recentioribus documentis pontificis*: PerMorCanLit 40 (1951) 5-28; F. Cabrol: DACL 2,2795-99; K. Federer, *Liturgie und Glaube: "Legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi"* Prosperi Aquitani: ML 51,209 (1950).

then the private revelations are the *occasions*, by which the attention of the Church is aroused to attribute true worship to God or the Saints according to revealed doctrine.¹⁰

762. Scholium 2. The understanding which the Apostles had of the deposit of faith—was it more perfect than what is had today by the Church, or was it not?

Straub, n.221; Palmieri, *Proleg.* § 30; Dorsch, p.766, and others respond *affirmatively*.

To prove this they appeal to John 14:26; 15:15; 16:12-15; Acts 1:8; 1 Cor. 2:6-12; 7:40; 2 Cor. 4:6; 11:6; Gal. 1:16; Eph. 3:3-5.

They confirm the same idea from Irenaeus: R 213, 242; from Tertullian: R 298. They add further from Irenaeus: "For we have not known the disposition of our salvation from others, but from those through whom the Gospel came to us... the foundation and pillar of our faith. For it is not allowed to say that before they preached they had perfect knowledge... afterwards they were endowed with the power from on high of the descending Holy Spirit; they were filled with all things and had perfect knowledge."¹¹

Likewise from Tertullian: "They are wont to say that the Apostles did not know everything... But who of sound mind can believe that they did not know, whom the Lord gave us as Teachers... who explained certain obscure things to them separately, while saying to them that it is given to them to know hidden things that he could not make known to the people? Was something hidden from Peter, called the rock of the Church to be built, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth? And was something hidden from John, very much loved by the Lord, who leaned on his breast, and to whom alone the Lord manifested the traitor Judas, and whom in his place he designated as the son of Mary? What did he not want them to know, to whom he also showed his glory, and Moses and Elijah, and also the voice of the Father from heaven?... On one occasion he had said clearly: 'I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now' (John 16:12); nevertheless he added: 'When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth'; here he shows that those men were ignorant of nothing, to whom he had promised that they would obtain all truth through the Spirit of truth."¹²

There is also Epiphanius: "The words 'he will guide you into all the truth' (John 16:13) can refer to the heavenly gift which they were going to receive, that indeed the Holy Spirit was going to dwell in them, who would clearly declare everything to them that they were able to understand in this life."¹³

St. Thomas agrees: "Those who were closer to Christ, either before, like John the Baptist, or later, like the Apostles, had a fuller knowledge of the faith."¹⁴

10. See H. Dieckmann, n.823. On the questions which are raised in our time about the evolution of dogmas, see H. de Lubac, S.J., *Le problème du développement du Dogme*: RechScRel 35 (1948) 130-160; Excm. Fr. García, *La solución de Suarez al problema de la evolución o progreso dogmático*: EstEcl 22 (1948) 151-165, more accurate is the article of I. Alfaro, *El progreso dogmático en Suarez*: AnalGreg 68 (1954) 95-122. See above II n.56. Cano, *De locis* 12,3 concl.3.

11. St. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 3,1-2: MG 7,844.

12. Tertullian, *De praescript.* C.22: ML 2,34.

13. St. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 66 n.61: MG 42,122.

14. S.Th. I-II, q. 106, a. 4 and ad 2; II-II, q. 1, a. 7 ad 4; q. 176, a. 1 ad 1.

*Therefore it seems necessary to say that the Apostles had a fuller and more profound knowledge of the deposit of revelation simply, although with some limitations, and in some things they did not define it as explicitly as the later Church did, as the circumstances required, and as she often had to do.*¹⁵

763. Objections. 1. Public revelations were made to St. Paul, which the other Apostles did not receive. But St. Paul was not among the Apostles, who from the promise of Christ were going to receive all truth: John 14:24-26; 15:15; 16:12-15. Therefore others besides the Apostles, who from the promise of Christ were going to receive all truth, were able to receive new revelations.

I distinguish the major. As to an Apostles and within the apostolic time, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. *I concede the minor and distinguish the consequent.* If they had the same Apostolate, *conceded*; If they were not Apostles, *I subdistinguish*: within the apostolic time and by the Apostles new revelations could be received from those who were not Apostles, *conceded*; outside of the apostolic time and independently of the acceptance of the Apostles, *denied*.

2. The Holy Spirit was promised no less to the Apostles as a helper than to their successors: John 14:16. But he could reveal new things to the Apostles which Christ had not revealed: John 14:26; 16:12-13. Therefore new things could be revealed also to the successors of the Apostles.

I distinguish the major. As assisting in order to guard the deposit of revelation, *conceded*; as inspiring or speaking in order to increase the same deposit, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and consequence.*

3. Without new revelations dogmatic progress cannot take place. But dogmatic progress does take place. Therefore there are also new revelations.

I distinguish the major. In revelation which constitutes the object of Catholic faith, *conceded*; in the understanding, declaration and proposing of the revealed deposit, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*

4. Objective progress of revelation took place in the O.T. But the N.T. is not in a worse but is rather in a better condition than the O.T. Therefore objective progress of revelation must take place in the N.T.

I distinguish the major. It was so because the revelation of the O.T. was incomplete and ordained to the full revelation of the N.T., *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. *I concede the minor and distinguish the consequent.* If the revelation of the N.T. were incomplete and ordained to another revelation, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. And on the basis of these distinctions, *I deny the consequence.*

765. 5. By an infallible definition it happens that a truth must be believed with faith, which before the definition did not have to be believed. But what must be believed with faith is revealed. Therefore by an infallible definition there is a new revelation.

15. F. Marín-Sola, *La evolución homogénea del Dogma católico* n.57, seems to exaggerate, when, forced by his theory of the evolution of dogma, he says: "All dogmas, whether those which the Church has already defined or those which will be defined in the future, were known by the Apostles, not only mediately or virtually or implicitly, but also immediately and formally and explicitly with knowledge divinely infused into them."

I distinguish the major. This happens *regarding us* because of the declaration of the infallible Magisterium by which a revelation is made known to us which before was hidden from us, *conceded*; this happens *regarding itself* because by the infallible definition something in itself new is revealed, *denied*. *I concede the minor*; *I also distinguish the consequent.* *Regarding us, conceded*; *regarding itself, denied*.

6. By an infallible definition truths must be believed which before the definition were only connected with revealed truths. Therefore by an infallible definition they become new revelations.

I distinguish the antecedent. *With ecclesiastical faith* which some authors admit, *I bypass that*; *with divine faith, I subdistinguish*: virtual, mediated, indirect or commanded, *I bypass that*; with formal, immediate, direct or elicited divine faith, *I subdistinguish*: if before the definition they were only connected with revealed truths not only regarding us but also regarding themselves, *denied*; if before the definition they were only connected with revealed truths, but not regarding themselves but only regarding us, then by definition they become truths to believe with formal and elicited faith, *again I subdistinguish*: if by the infallible definition they are proposed as divinely revealed or as to be believed, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. On the basis of the given distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

766. 7. By an infallible definition the typical meaning of a text of Scripture can be declared. But this does not seem to be able to take place without a new revelation. Therefore an infallible definition seems to be equivalent to a new revelation.

I distinguish the major. With the help of the truths of the deposit of revelation contained in Scripture or in Tradition, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Without a new revelation which however already at least implicitly is contained in Scripture or in Tradition, *conceded*; without a revelation completely new and which is not implicitly contained in Scripture or in Tradition, *denied*.

8. Through the assistance of God an infallible definition of the Church implicates the authority of God. But what implicates the authority of God is at least implicitly revealed. Therefore through the assistance of God what is defined infallibly must be said to be at least implicitly revealed.

I distinguish the major. It implicates the authority of God assisting the Church speaking, *conceded*; it implicates the authority of God speaking with a speech that is attesting, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*¹⁶

16. See Muncunill, *De locis* n.133f.146-149; Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.69; Alonso-Bárcena, *De Magisterio* th.15.

ARTICLE II

ON THE PRIMARY SOURCE OF REVELATION

Thesis 19. The primary source of revelation is the divine tradition of the Apostles, which in antiquity, fullness and sufficiency surpasses Holy Scripture itself.

767. St. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* (see R 191-262); Tertullian, *De praescript. haeret.* (see R 288-300); Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium* (see R 2168-2175); S. Th. II-II, q.5, a. 3; III, q. 25, a. 3 ad 4; M. Cano, *De locis theologicis* l.3; St. R. Bellarmine, *De controversiis* 1, controversia 1, *De verbo Dei scripto et non scripto*; Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.4; Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*; De San, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*; Muncunill, *De locis theologicis*; Bainvel, *De Magisterio et Traditione*; Ph. Alonso-Bárcena, *De Ecclesiae Magisterio, de divina Traditione* (1945). In the treatises *On the Church*, see Lercher, th.54; Dorsch, p.679; De Groot, q.19-21; Michelitsch, c.44; Schultes, c.8; Cotter, *Theol. Fundam.* Th.38-40. *Monographs*: A. Deneffe, *Der Traditionsbegriff* (1931); Ranft, *Der Ursprung des Traditionsprinzips* (1931); D. van den Eynde, *Les normes de l'enseignement* (1933); A. Michel, *Tradition*: DTC 15,1252-1350 (1946); Zapelena, 2 (1q954) th.20; H. Bacht, *Tradition und Sakrament*: Schol 30 (1955) 1-32.

768. Connection. We have proved that the Magisterium of the Church was instituted by Christ to guard and infallibly declare the revealed doctrine (D 3020). In the preceding thesis we showed that this deposit of divine revelation was complete with the Apostles. Now we ask: Where is this divine revelation contained or what are the sources from which it can be derived? This could be a suitable place to treat both sources of revelation, namely, both Scripture and Tradition; however, for the sake of brevity here we will not consider Scripture, because it will be handled in its own treatise. Therefore in the thesis we are speaking only about Tradition.

769. Definition of terms. A source or fount of revelation, like a fountain of water, in general is said to be a deposit or place in which divine revelation is contained or from which it can be drawn

Tradition, in Greek ἡ παράδοσις, in virtue of the word signifies the transmission of any kind of thing. The same word is also used in Scripture with this varying meaning.¹

In the broad sense of the N.T., but still in a proper sense, the word "Tradition" signifies the transmission of the teaching of Christ and of the Apostles, or the continued transmission of divine revelation in the Church since the Apostles (see Luke 1:2; 2 Thess. 2:15; 3:6; 1 Cor. 15:1-11). But this transmission happens in two ways, according to the words of St. Paul:

1. F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti Lexicon graecum παράδοσις*. On the concept of Tradition among theologians since the year 1850, see O. Mueller, *Zum Begriff der Tradition in der Theologie der letzten hundert Jahre*: MünchThSt 4 (1953) 164-186; C. Balic, *Il senso Cristiano*: Greg 33 (1952) 106-134.

“hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, *either by word of mouth or by letter*” (2 Thess. 2:15). Accordingly, the way of tradition is twofold: a) *divinely inspired Scripture*, and b) *the oral preaching and faith of the Church*, or another means distinct from Holy Scripture.

770. Hence *divine Tradition in the strict sense*, as it is distinguished from Holy Scripture, can be defined: Continued conservation and transmission of divine revelation since the Apostles *by oral preaching and the faith of the Church*, or by a means distinct from Holy Scripture: see 1 Cor. 15:1.2.3.11.14: “I delivered to you what I also received; I preached to you the Gospel which you have received, unless you believed in vain; so we preach and so you have believed.” The *conservation* of divine Tradition is from God, because “it pertains to the same cause to establish and to preserve that which it has established”: II-II, q. 79, a. 1.

771. *This Tradition in the strict sense*, if it is compared with Scripture, is usually named in three ways: a) that whose object is not in Scripture is said to be *constitutive*; b) that whose object is in Scripture explicitly is said to be *inherent*; c) that whose object is only implicitly in Scripture is called *declarative*.

772. Again this *Tradition in the strict sense*, about which the thesis on the sources of revelation is concerned exclusively, is called *divine*, because it has *God* himself as its *first author* and conserver (see 1 Cor. 7:10). It is distinguished from *purely apostolic* tradition, or that which has an *Apostle* as its *first author* (see 1 Cor. 7:12), and also from *ecclesiastical* tradition, which has the *Church* as its *first author* (D 1645, 1863).

773. In this *divine Tradition in the strict sense*, under the conserving action of *God* himself, a fourfold element can be distinguished: a) The *object*, which is handed on, that is, the Deposit of divine revelation;

b) The *subject*, which hands it on, that is, the Church of Christ since the time of the Apostles;

c) The *acts*, by which it is handed on, that is, oral preaching and the faith of the Church;

d) The *effects* of tradition, that is, the remembrances of the preaching and of the faith of the Church.

774. A. *By reason of the object* Tradition is said to be *objective* and usually is distinguished in two ways:

- a) *Dogmatic* is that whose object is a truth to be believed with divine faith;
- b) *Disciplinary* is that whose object is a divine precept that is to be observed perpetually by the members of the Church (see D 3060).

775. B. *By reason of the subject* Tradition is said to be subjective. But the subjects or *Organs of Tradition* are said to be physical or moral persons, who transmit the objective Tradition to the whole Church. They are of two kinds:

- a) *The primary or authentic organs of Tradition* are the physical or moral persons, who have the office in the Church of guarding and declaring the objective Tradition: such are the Apostles, the Pope, the Councils of Bishops, Bishops.
- b) *The secondary organs of Tradition* are other persons, who, under the vigilance of the preceding, transmit the objective Tradition in the Church: such are thought to be Preachers, Teachers, Authors, Artists, all the faithful, inasmuch as they are treating revealed religion or professing it.

776. C. *By reason of the acts*, by which it is transmitted, Tradition is called *active*, and it is a complex of acts by which the Organs of Tradition transmit the objective Tradition in the Church. With St. Paul, these acts can be reduced to *preaching and the faith of the Church* (1 Cor. 15:1.3.11). Active Tradition takes two forms:

- a) *Constitutive active Tradition* is the preaching and faith of the whole Church during the age of the Apostles, under the action of God revealing.
- b) *Preservative active Tradition* is the preaching and faith of the whole Church in the ages that follow the death of the Apostles, under the action of God preserving the revelation.

777. D. *By reason of the effects* of Tradition, Tradition can be called *effective*, which is a complex of monuments or works, by which the Organs of Tradition by their acts have left the objective Tradition transmitted to posterity. These monuments of Tradition are of two kinds:

- a) *The primary or authentic monuments of Tradition* are the works which exist as the authentic Organs of Tradition as such. These are acts or writings of the Apostles, Supreme Pontiffs, Councils and Bishops.
- b) *The secondary monuments of Tradition* are works which exist as the secondary Organs of Tradition as such. These are the acts or writings of the holy Fathers, Theologians, ecclesiastical Authors and of the faithful, which have to do with things pertaining to revealed religion; also included are works of Christian art, archeological remains, sculptures, ruins of

buildings, paintings and other things of that nature, by which the preaching or faith of the Church is made manifest.

778. That the **source of revelation** is *divine Tradition* signifies that it is preserved and transmitted in the Church from the time of the Apostles, with God attesting to the revealed truths, and therefore it means that the handed on word of God is contained in it.

The primary source is said to be divine Tradition, because primarily and per se it was ordained and intended by Christ so that his divine revelation may be transmitted continually in the Church.

779. Therefore the **source of public divine revelation**, if we speak in the strictest way, is *the deposit of faith itself* or the word of God, and indeed *primarily Transmitted, secondarily Written*. The original notion of the *deposit of faith* and the derived notion of the *source of revelation* are correlative notions, which under a twofold aspect look at the same reality *of the word of God*. Hence Scripture and Tradition, as *original sources of revelation*, can be properly defined and accurately discerned by the Magisterium of the Church.

a) *Holy Scripture*, or the written word of God, is the deposit of revealed truths *inspired by God*, which are contained in the holy books of the Old and New Testament.

b) *Divine Tradition*, or the handed on word of God, is the deposit of revealed truths *attested by God*, which in the continuing preaching and faith of the Church are perennially preserved by God.

c) The authentic *Magisterium* is the doctrinal authority of the Church, which *with the assistance of God* guards, declares and explains the word of God or revelation in the deposit of faith or contained in both sources (D 3020, 3069-3070). Therefore, the *Magisterium*, in the strict sense, since formally it is the word of the ministers of the Church protected *by the assistance of God alone*, cannot properly be said to be the word of God nor an *original* source of divine revelation; but rather it is the *guardian, interpreter and explainer* of the word of God, which must necessarily draw from the deposit of faith as from its proper source. Such is the Magisterium committed to the Apostles as an ordinary office and transmitted to their successors by formal succession.

780. The concept of the **Rule of faith** is related to what was just said, and so *Scripture and Tradition* are customarily called by theologians *the remote Rule of faith*, but the Magisterium is called *the proximate Rule of faith*.

The Rule of faith theoretically is the principle according to which in general is determined which truths are divinely revealed and which all the faithful are bound to believe and to profess.

a) *Protestants* have established the following as a principle: "We believe that the Holy Scriptures alone are the unique and certain Rule of faith, on which all dogmas must be based."² This is the Protestant Rule of faith.

b) *Catholic* have always embraced as a principle what *Vatican Council I* defined with these words: "All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed" (D 3011). This is the Catholic Rule of faith. In it both Scripture and Tradition are included as sources, and as such they are distinguished from the Magisterium.

781. *Scripture and Tradition are, therefore, the remote and objective Rule of faith*, because from them, as from fountains, the Magisterium draws what is proposed for belief to the faithful.

The *Magisterium*, however, is the *proximate* and active *proximate Rule of faith*, because immediately from it the faithful are bound to learn what they must believe about those things that are contained in the sources of revelation, and what they must hold about those things that have a necessary connection with the revealed truths (see D 3018, 3020).

782. State of the question. In the thesis we hold that the divine Tradition of the Apostles in the strict sense is the primary source of revelation; from that we deduce the main properties whereby Tradition as a source surpasses Scripture.

783. Adversaries. 1) In general, the *Gnostics* were opposed to the principle of Tradition; against them St. Irenaeus and Tertullian unanswerably affirmed the classical doctrine about Tradition.³ Against the *Donatists*, who refused to admit the validity of baptism conferred by heretics, St. Augustine appealed to the authority of Tradition (R 1623, 1631), and against Pelagius he said: "what we do not read (in Scripture) we believe is contrary to the divine law," and he affirms that Tradition is the source of faith.⁴

2. Declaration of the *Confessionis Augustanae*, *De Regula fidei* 1: Müller-Kolde, *Die symbolischen Bücher der evang. luther. Kirche* 569.

3. St. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*: MG 7; Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*: ML 2.

4. St. Augustine, *De natura et gratia* c.39: ML 44,269; G. Martil, *La tradición en S. Agustín* (1943).

2) *Schismatic Orientals* always have held the correct doctrine on the two sources of revelation. Except in the Russian Church in the year 1711 Procopovitch defended the opinion of the Protestants on "Scripture as *the only rule of faith* and the norm of Christian truth," and he made it prevail, until once again, since the year 1836, they generally rejected it as heretical.⁵

784. 3) *Protestants* surely recognized that holy Scripture is a source of faith, but they have refused totally to accept Tradition. Already their precursor, Wycliffe, said: "Truth that is not in Scripture is nowhere."⁶ In the Protestant *Concordiae Formula*, n.1, they say: "We believe the unique Rule of faith that there is absolutely nothing other than the prophetic and apostolic writings both of the Old and of the New Testaments."

And we read assertions similar to this also in the Protestant *Augustine, Swiss and Belgian Confessions*, and also in the *Anglican Articles* n.6.⁷ Similarly Calvin said: "We embrace the Old and New Testament as *the only rule of faith*... and so in general I repudiate whatever had been introduced without the authority of the [written] Word of God."⁸

Contemporary authors, like Barth, agree. He says: "it is absolutely impossible that there should be something revealed or in the strict sense an authoritative word of God outside of Holy Scripture alone." But Cullmann holds that the times of the post-apostolic Church differ in authority and indeed essentially from the apostolic times; therefore according to him, Tradition as a divine norm of faith existed only during the time of the Apostles; but after the death of St. John the Apostle, the apostolic writings are the only divine norm of faith.⁹

785. 4) *Naturalists and Rationalists, in general*, hold that reason alone is the unique source of truth. See Pius IX, *Allocution "Singulari quadam"*; Brief "*Eximiam tuam*"; Letter "*Gravissimas inter*" (D 1642-1643 [34th ed.], 2827, 2850).

5) Finally, the *Modernists* subject everything to evolutionary change and transformation, and pervert the notion itself of Tradition. See the Decree of Pius X "*Lamentabili*" and the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" (D 3409, 3412, 3419, 3454, 3458, 3462).

786. Doctrine of the Church. A. On the divine Tradition of the Apostles the *Council of Trent* (D 1501) by a solemn judgment intended to define what its first Presider, Cardinal de Monte, said on February 26, 1546:

5. M. Jugie, *Theologia dogmatica Christianorum Orientalium dissidentium* 1 p.642-52.

6. I. Wycliffe, *De civili dominio* 1,44; H.B. Workman, *John Wyclif. A Study of the English Medieval Church* (1926).

7. Müller-Kolde, *Die symbolische Bücher* 517-569; K. Müller, *die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* 172.234.506. See J. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.208-329; C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa* 700.

8. John Calvin, *Tractatus theologicus* (Amsterdam 1667) p.91f.

9. K. Barth, *Die Schrift und die Kirche* (1947) 8; O. Cullmann, *Die Tradition* (1954). See H. Bacht, *Tradition und Sakrament*: Schol 30 (1955) 1-32; see above n.382.691.

"After this holy Synod received the sacred books, it seemed fitting to proceed with laying the foundations of faith, and that together with the sacred books the traditions should be received and be inserted in one and the same decree. For, we are bound to confess that these traditions are of equal authority with the sacred books themselves."¹⁰

That this point was defined by Trent in session IV is very clear from the history of the decree. For the Council intended to establish this principle, that Tradition in matters of faith and morals is a source of divine revelation, and indeed of the same authority as Scripture, because Tradition "emanates from the same Holy Spirit as the Scriptures." And it manifestly decreed the same thing with the words that the Council "receives and venerates with the same sense of loyalty and reverence all the books of the Old and New Testament... together with all the traditions" (D 1501), as the acts of the Council irrefutably demonstrate.¹¹

787. B. *That Tradition is the primary source of revelation and that Scripture needs it in order to interpret its true meaning*—this is certainly deduced from the Tridentine doctrine (D 1507-1508, 1532; see 1703).¹²

Vatican Council I renewed the definition of Trent (D 3006), and further, what the *Council of Trent* taught on the criterion of Tradition in order to arrive at the genuine meaning of Holy Scripture, *it declared authentically in a more clear manner* (D 3007).

Pius X in the "*Oath against the Errors of Modernism*" commanded that the doctrine be professed on Tradition as a source of revelation, and he decreed that the method of the *Rationalists* in interpreting Scripture be rejected (D 3541, 3543f.).

Pius XII in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" clearly teaches that: a) Scripture and Tradition are *two* sources of revelation in which the *whole* deposit of faith is contained; b) this *whole deposit of faith* has been entrusted, not to individual Christians or to theologians, but to be authentically interpreted by the Magisterium of the Church *alone*; c) therefore the holy Magisterium is the *proximate and universal norm* or rule of the truths of faith. From this also manifestly the distinction is drawn which exists between the Magisterium and the sources of revelation. Let us read the text of the Pontiff himself:

10. CTr 1,493.

11. The words "with the same sense of reverence" used by the Council call to mind the saying of St. Basil, *De Spiritu Sancto* 27,66: "Of the beliefs and practices... preserved in the Church, some we possess derived from written teaching; others we have received delivered to us 'in a mystery' by the Tradition of the Apostles; and both of these in relation to true religion have the same force" (R 954). CTr 1,484-485. For the history of this decree and its proper meaning, see J. Salaverri, *La Tradición valorada como fuente de revelación en el Concilio de Trento*: EstEcl 20 (1946) 33-62.

12. The same thing is confirmed from the history of chapter 8 of the decree on justification of the *Council of Trent*. See EstEcl 20 (1946) 57-58. How *Vatican I* completed *Trent* in this matter is clarified by Franzelin: Msi 50,80; see V. Gasser: CL 7,143f.146.

“This sacred Office of Teacher in matters of faith and morals must be the proximate and universal criterion of truth for all theologians, since to it has been entrusted by Christ our Lord the whole deposit of faith—*Sacred Scripture and divine Tradition*—to be preserved, guarded and interpreted... It is also true that theologians must always return to the sources of divine revelation: for it belongs to them to point out how the doctrine of the living Teaching Authority is to be found either explicitly or implicitly *in the Scriptures and in Tradition*... For, together with the sources of positive theology God has given to his Church a living Teaching Authority to elucidate and explain what is contained in the deposit of faith only obscurely and implicitly. This deposit of faith our Divine Redeemer has given for authentic interpretation not to each of the faithful, not even to theologians, but only to the Teaching Authority of the Church.”¹³

788. Theological note. *First of all*, that Scripture and Tradition are two true sources of divine revelation endowed with equal authority is a *doctrine of divine faith defined by a solemn judgment in the Councils, especially by Trent and Vatican I* (D 1501, 3006). *In the second place*, that Tradition is the *primary* source of revelation, which surpasses Scripture, is an *implicitly defined* dogma in the same Councils, or *at least theologically certain*, or deduced certainly from the definitions of the same Councils (D 1508, 3007).

789. Proof of the first part. The divine Tradition of the Apostles is the primary source of revelation.

The general argument. The divine Tradition of the Apostles is the continuing preservation of the divine revelation coming from the Apostles and its transmission by the oral preaching and faith of the Church. But the primary source of revelation, or what first of all and per se was ordained and intended by Christ, is the continuing preservation and transmission of the Gospel by the oral preaching and faith of the Church. Therefore the primary source of revelation is the divine Tradition of the Apostles.

The major is the definition itself of Tradition.

790. The minor is proved. 1) **From the testimony of Christ himself.** The *primary* source of revelation is that means of the transmission of the Gospel, which alone Christ used, and *firstly and per se* commanded his Apostles to use. But the means of the transmission of the Gospel, which alone Christ used, and firstly and per se commanded his Apostles to use, is the continued preservation and transmission of revelation by the oral preaching and faith of the Church. Therefore the primary source of revelation is the continued preservation and transmission of the Gospel by the oral preaching and faith of the Church.

The major is per se clear, because it is the definition of the primary object.

13. Pius XII: AAS 42 (1950) 567ff; see *ibid.* 563.

The minor. a) It is clear from the whole evangelical history that oral preaching is the *only* means of transmission of the Gospel which *Christ himself* used.

b) It is certain that oral preaching, and the resulting faith, is the means of preservation and transmission of the Gospel, which Christ *firstly and per se* commanded his Apostles to use; because the Church knows nothing about a command of writing given to the Apostles by Christ, but we do have the formal and express precept of Christ himself about the command of oral preaching in order to preserve and transmit the whole revelation to all men, under the continuing assistance of the Holy Spirit, and with the obligation of embracing it with faith: Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; John 14:16.26; 15:15.16.26; Acts 1:8; 10:39-42.

791. *The minor* of n. 789 is proved 2) **from the testimony of the Apostles.** A. *From the way of acting of the Apostles.* The source of revelation, which is primary or firstly and per se ordained or intended by Christ, doubtless is that means of the transmission of the Gospel, which *all Apostles* used in order to transmit the whole revelation of Christ to men. But the means which all the Apostles used to transmit the whole revelation of Christ to men was not Scripture, but oral preaching and the resulting faith of the hearers. Therefore the primary source of revelation is the oral preaching of the Gospel and the resulting faith of the hearers.

The major is certain from the supposition, about which there cannot be any real doubt, that *all the Apostles* faithfully observed what Christ firstly and per se ordained for them, when they received from Christ himself the whole revelation with the command to transmit it to all men.

792. *The minor* will be explained part by part.

a) *Not all the Apostles used Scripture* to transmit the revelation of Christ to men, for, *of the thirteen Apostles, seven of them*, namely, Andrew, Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, James of Zebedee, Simon of Cana and Mathias did not leave anything written for us.

b) Of the Apostles who wrote something, *no one intended to hand down in writing the whole revelation*, but rather *on a given occasion* and in order to satisfy *a particular purpose*, they handed down a few things in writing. So therefore Matthew wrote his Gospel, John his Gospel along with three letters and the book of Revelation, James of Alphaeus one letter, Peter two letters, Jude one letter, and finally Paul fourteen letters. In the introduction to each of the books of Scripture an explanation is given about the *occasion*

for the writing of the book and the *particular purpose*.¹⁴ Indeed St. John himself, who was the last one of all to write, says that there are many more things which have not been written down, and he clearly states the particular purpose that moved him to write (John 20:30f.; 21:25; 1 John 5:13; 2 John 12; 3 John 13).

c) *Not one of the Apostles claims for himself the office of writing; but all of them exercised the office of preaching* (Mark 16:20; Acts 1:8; 4:33; 9:20); in fact the Apostles vindicated for themselves the obligation to fulfill *the office of preaching* (Acts 2:32; 3:15; 4:18-20; 5:32; 10:39-42; 13:31; 26:16-18; 1 Cor. 9:16; 1 Tim. 2:7 (εἰς ὃ [μαρτύριον] ἐτέθην ἐγώ) “a preacher and apostle, a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and in truth”; see 2 Tim. 1:11.

793. B. From the fact that the Apostles appeal first and per se to oral preaching. The primary source of revelation should be thought to be that to which the Apostles first and per se appeal and from which especially the faithful are confirmed in the true faith. But the Apostles first and per se appeal to the oral preaching and from it especially the faithful are confirmed in the true faith. Therefore the primary source of revelation is oral preaching and the faith of the Church which follows from it.

The major is per se apparent.

The minor is proved: a) The Apostles first and per se appeal to oral preaching, for St. Paul in the *last* letter that he wrote, when he is admonishing his disciple and successor, *appeals not to his thirteen prior letters* nor to the other books of the N.T., but only to the oral preaching (2 Tim. 1:13; 2:2).

b) St. Paul himself intends to confirm the faithful in the true faith, not from the Scriptures of the N.T., but from the oral preaching (2 Thess. 2:5.15; 1 Cor. 7:17; 15:1-14; 2 Cor. 1:18; Gal. 1:8; Col. 2:6).

794. The minor of n. 789 is confirmed, 3) from the testimony of the holy Fathers and of the ecclesiastical authors.

a) In this matter, Saints Irenaeus and Augustine are in marvelous agreement with the teaching of St. Paul. For, St. Paul, wishing to confirm the Corinthians in their faith in the resurrection, appeals to this as the supreme reason: “Whether then it was I or they [the Apostles], so we *preach* and so you *believed*... If Christ has not been raised, then our *preaching* is in vain and your *faith* is in vain” (1 Cor. 15:11-14). So the argumentation of St. Paul goes like this: “We *have preached* and you *have believed* the resurrection

14. A. Merk, *Introductionis in singulos Novi Testamenti libros compendium* (1940); L. Pirot, *La Sainte bible* t.9-12 (1935-1938); J. Huby, *L'Evangile de N.S.J.-Ch.* (1954).

of Christ. But it is impossible that our *preaching* and your *faith* are in vain. Therefore it is true that Christ rose from the dead.”¹⁵

795. St. Irenaeus argues similarly when he writes: “The Church, having received this *preaching* and this *faith*, although scattered throughout the whole world, yet as if occupying one house, carefully preserves it. She also believes these points [of doctrine] just as if she had one soul, and one and the same heart, and she proclaims them, and teaches them, and hands them down, with perfect harmony, as if she possessed one mouth” (R 192). This is simply *the preaching of the truth*.¹⁶

St. Augustine agrees with this when writing against Julian Eclanensis: “Although it may not be proved by any reason or explained by any words, nevertheless it is true that since ancient times *it is preached with true Catholic faith and is believed* throughout the whole Church.”¹⁷ Therefore, according to St. Augustine with St. Irenaeus and St. Paul, that truth is to be held as revealed which is *preached with Catholic faith and is believed* throughout the whole Church.¹⁸

796. b) The same point can be proved with many other opinions of the Fathers. Let it be sufficient to consult St. Clement of Rome (R 20), St. Papias (R 94), St. Irenaeus (R 212, 213), Tertullian (R 291, 292, 293, 295, 298), Origen (R 443), St. Athanasius (R 785), St. Basil (R 954), St. Gregory of Nyssa (R 1043), St. Epiphanius (R 1098), St. Chrysostom (R 1213), St. Jerome (R 1358), St. Augustine (R 1419, 1623, 1631, 1899), St. Vincent of Lérins (R 2168, 2169).¹⁹

797. Proof of the second part. Tradition as a source of revelation surpasses Holy Scripture itself in antiquity, fullness and sufficiency.

A. In antiquity that source of revelation surpasses another, which existed temporally before it. But the divine Tradition of the Apostles, that is, the preaching of the Apostles and the faith of the Church, existed before Scripture of the N.T. Therefore in antiquity the Tradition surpasses Scripture itself.

The minor is proved, because after the Ascension of the Lord the preaching of the Apostles and the faith in the Church existed for about 20 years, before the year 50 when, according to the more probable opinion, the first book of the N.T. was written, St. Matthew’s *Gospel*.²⁰ The testimonies

15. See A. Merk, *Traditionis momentum apud S. Paulum*: VerDom 4 (1924) 332 and 362.

16. St. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 1,10,2: MG 7,552.

17. St. Augustine, *Contra Iulianum* 6,511: ML 44,828. See G. Martil, *loc.cit.*

18. See what we wrote in EstEcl 20 (1946) 60f.

19. See Rouet, *Index theologicus*, n.78-80.

20. Knabenbauer-Merk, *Commentarius in Evangelium S. Matthaei* (1912) Intro. VII; D. Buzy, *Evangile selon Saint Matthieu*; L. Pirot, *La Sainte Bible* 9 (1934) Intro.; S. Rosadini, *Institutiones introductoriae in libris N.T.* v.1 (1938).

of Scripture confirm this point, since they presuppose a Tradition already existing previously (Luke 1:1-4; 2 Thess. 2:5.15; Gal. 1:8).

798. B. *In fullness* that source of revelation surpasses, which contains all the truths *per se revealed*, that is, the entire *deposit of faith*. But the continued preaching of the Gospel and faith in the Church contain all the *per se revealed* truths, but the books of the N.T. do not contain all of them. Therefore, in fullness Tradition surpasses Scripture itself.

The major is clear, because we are dealing with the *per se revealed* truths only when we are talking about *the deposit of revelation* and its sources. Therefore, although by reason of the truths revealed *per accidens* Scripture is more full, this is really a certain *per accidens fullness*, but not a full and *per se fullness* about which we are now inquiring.²¹

The minor. It is certain from the definition of the terms that the continued preaching of the Gospel and faith in the Church contain the whole deposit of faith or revelation; and this can be confirmed from Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15f.; to these can be added the testimony of St. Irenaeus (R 213).

799. The minor. b) That the books of the N.T. do not contain all the *per se revealed* truths is certain first of all from the particular purpose intended by the authors in writing them, as was explained above. It is certain *secondly*, because several *per se revealed* truths can be cited, which are not found in the holy Scriptures, and here are a few examples: "the Church received the tradition from the Apostles" that children should be baptized (D 1514; Origen R 501); it is not necessary to give the Eucharist to baptized infants in danger of death, even though the Lord said, *unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink he blood, you have no life in you* (John 6:53) D 1730; "the Church has held as a very wholesome custom" that those who were validly baptized by heretics are not to be re-baptized (St. Augustine, R. 1623); in certain cases it is allowed to swear an oath, although the Lord said: *But I say to you, Do not swear at all* (Matt. 5:34-37); *each and every book of the N.T.* is divinely inspired; the four Gospels and no more are inspired by God; there are only seven sacraments of the New Law.²² *Thirdly*, this is certain from the testimony of St. Irenaeus, St. Basil, St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine and others (see R 213, 954, 1098, 1213, 1419, 1623).

21. S.Th. II-II, q. 1, a. 6 ad 1.

22. See the several things concerning worship and the Sacraments and their administration that the *Council of Trent* attributes to the Tradition of the Apostles (D 1530-1531, 1648, 1695, 1743, 1745f.).

800. C. *In sufficiency* that source of revelation surpasses, which does not need *another source as such*, neither to establish its own divine authority nor to make known its own meaning. But Scripture needs *Tradition as a source of revelation* in order to establish its own authority and to make known its meaning, but Tradition needs *no other source as such*. Therefore in sufficiency, the Tradition of the Apostles surpasses Scripture itself.

The minor. a) Scripture needs Tradition as a source of revelation in order to establish its own divine authority. For, *the fact of inspiration*, on which the authority the divine authority of Scripture depends, is a *per se revealed truth*; therefore it must be contained in the sources of revelation. But the fact of inspiration *of each and every book of the N.T.* is certain only from divine Tradition, as is proved in the thesis on inspiration.²³ Therefore, Scripture needs Tradition as a source of revelation in order to establish its own divine authority.

801. The minor. b) Scripture needs Tradition as a source of revelation *in order to make known its own authentic meaning in many things*. For, Scripture was entrusted to the Magisterium of the Church to guard it and to explain it authentically. Indeed the Magisterium of the Church, from the analysis alone of Scripture and independently of truths contained in the other source of revelation, can surely in many things make known the authentic meaning of Scripture; but in many other areas, as are especially *the prophetic and typical meanings* intended not rarely by God in Scripture, the Magisterium itself of the Church does not seem to be able to explain the Scriptures *by itself, except with the help of truths*, which are contained *in another source of revelation*. Therefore, Scripture needs Tradition as a source of revelation in order to make known its own authentic meaning.

802. The minor. c) This is confirmed by the testimonies of the holy Fathers, who either suppose or assert that Tradition is necessary in order to interpret Scripture correctly. Thus St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, St. Augustine, Vincent of Lérins and others (see R 242, 291 474 656, 1581, 2168).

23. S. Tromp, *De Sacrae Scripturae Inspiratione* (1945) 25 scholium 1, De criterio inspirationis; A. Merk, *Institutiones Biblicae* (1937) l.1, De Inspiratione, n.6-21, 110-114. In Scripture, he says, "there are only traces of the doctrine on inspiration related to the N.T."; A.C. Cotter, *Theologia Fundamentalis* (1940) th.51: "The only certain and universal criterion of biblical inspiration is originally public revelation, and therefore for us it is Tradition" (see IV, 43-55).

803. Scholium 1. The argument of prescription.²⁴ 1) *The argument of Tradition in the strict sense* is that whereby from the monuments of Tradition it is directly proved that the doctrine of faith or morals has been faithfully transmitted in the Church from the Apostles to us. But it is often difficult and too long to make this argument, and at times it also turns out to be impossible, because the documents are lacking which go all the way back to the Apostles. When this direct proof is impossible or very difficult one can then make use of Prescription.

2) *The argument of Prescription* is that whereby from the monuments of Tradition *indirectly* one deduces that the doctrine of faith or morals has been handed down from the Apostles.

The principle on which the argument of prescription is founded is this: The doctrine of the Apostles is a legitimate possession proper to the Church alone, to which Christ committed his doctrine as a deposit to be entirely protected and faithfully transmitted.²⁵

Indeed the legitimacy of possession *legally* can be proved in two ways, either by positive documents that are reliable or by Prescription. Since the positive documents are lacking, recourse can be made to Prescription, which is a legal title based on a long-standing possession, by which the legitimacy of the ownership of the thing is proved and by which others are excluded from action concerning the same thing.

Tertullian transferred this juridical way of proving something in order to demonstrate the apostolic nature of the doctrine, which is in the possession of the Church, with the argument that is called "Prescription."²⁶

804. 3) There are two forms of this argument, namely, one of *historical* or apologetic *prescription*, and the other of *theological* or dogmatic *prescription*. *The first* is reduced to this: The whole Church has this doctrine, received from the Apostles, with a possession of long duration. But what is found as one among many is not an error, but handed on" (Tertullian, *De praescr.* n.28). Therefore this doctrine really was handed down from the Apostles.

The other argument of theological Prescription also has two forms: a) *The positive form* can be reduced to this: The whole Church has this doctrine, received from the Apostles, with a possession of long duration. But the whole Church in virtue of her own infallibility cannot have for a long time in her possession a doctrine as apostolic, which really was not handed down by the Apostles. Therefore this doctrine really was handed down by the Apostles. b) *The negative form* of the argument goes like this: This doctrine was discovered later and it contradicts what the whole Church held previously

24. Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum*: ML 2,10-87; A. and P. Walenburch, *De controversiis tr.7 de praescriptionibus catholicis*: in Migne, *Theologiae Cursus* 1 co.923-940; I. Ottiger: *ZkathTh* (1881) 71ff.; Ch. Pesch, *Praelectiones* 1 n.411f.; Lercher, n.541; Cotter, 543f.; D. van den Eynde, *Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien* 198-202.

25. "It must be considered to whom the possession of the Scriptures belongs, lest someone be admitted to them who has no right to them." "The order of things requires what was at first proposed, which now must only be debated: it is in these things that faith fill be found" (Tertullian, *De praescr.* C.15.19.21: R 293).

26. See the treatise of Tertullian *On Prescription* cited in note 19: in R 288-300. The essential elements were already present in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haereses*: R 191-262; and in *Demonstr. Praedic. Evangel.*: R 263. See A.C. Cotter, *Theologia fundamentalis* 544.

with a possession of long duration, having received it from the Apostles. Therefore such doctrine cannot have been handed down by the Apostles.²⁷

Cotter correctly notes that the concepts of prescription in Law and in a theological argument are not univocal but analogous. Yet they agree because in both cases the prescription is dealing with a true possession and because the documents to prove it directly are lacking; however, they do differ in special way, because legal prescription establishes legitimacy, while theological prescription only makes the truth evident.

805. Scholium 2. The distinction of the Magisterium from the sources of revelation.²⁸

From the demonstrated thesis on Tradition we conclude that the original sources of revelation must be carefully distinguished from the Magisterium of the Church. Under the *generic* notion of a source, which we gave in n.769, it is clear that the Magisterium of the Church rightly also is called a source of divine revelation, inasmuch as for its object it has the truths revealed by God, as we saw in thesis 16. In this generic sense of a source, not only the Magisterium, but also everything that we have called the monuments of Tradition (n.777) can truly be said to be sources of divine revelation.

A distinction is made between the Sources of revelation and the Magisterium, if they are taken in a strict and specific sense (n.779). As the original sources of divine revelation, if they are taken strictly and formally, Scripture and Tradition really have God himself, whether inspiring or revealing, as their author, and therefore they are fully equal in their formally divine authority, just as the Councils of Trent and Vatican I declared their equality: D 1501, 3006. But no one identifies divinely inspired Scripture with ecclesiastical Magisterium protected by the assistance of God. Therefore, Tradition also is not to be identified with it according as and since it is a source of revelation, or according as it has God himself as its revealing author.²⁹

The Councils of Trent and Vatican I clearly distinguish both Scripture and Tradi-

27. The positive form: Tertullian, *loc. cit.*, 28; R 295. The negative form: Tertullian, *loc. cit.*, 29f.35: "Did error reign so long as there were no heresies?" "Before heresies was there true doctrine? But in all things the truth precedes the image: the similitude comes after the reality." "Where then is Marcion... where is Valentinus... For it is certain that they were not so formerly nor did they believe the Catholic doctrine found in the Roman Church." "Thus from order itself it is manifest that that is from the Lord and true which was at first handed down: but that is foreign and false which was proclaimed later." "Our position is not later, indeed it is before all others; this will be the testimony of the truth wherever it is fully recognized." Ed. Rauschen, *Floril. Patrist.* IV.

28. J. Salaverri, *loc. cit.*, in note 11; Ch. Baumgartner, *Tradition et Magistère*: RechScRel 41 (1953) 161-187; J. Filograssi, *Traditio, Magisterium et Theologia* in *De sanctissima Eucharistia* (1953) 7-68; C. Balic, *Il senso Cristiano e il progresso del Dogma: Lo sviluppo del Dogma* (1953) 106-134, see n.754.

29. In this matter the following authors are not correct: D. Chenu, *Une Ecole de théologie* (1937), and L. Charlier, *Essai sur le problème théologique* (1938), whose books were prohibited by the Holy Office: AAS 34 (1942) 37; but both authors laudably gave notice of their submission: AAS 34 (1942) 148. See F. Stegmüller-M.D. Koster: ThRev 38 (1939) 41-51; but especially see T. Zapelena: Greg 24 (1943) 23-47, 287-326; 25 (1944) 38-73, 247-282; R. Gagnebet and M. Labourdette: RevThom 45 (1939) 108-145; 46 (1946) 5-44. Pius XII several times mentions the distinction between the Magisterium and the sources of revelation in the Encyclical "*Humani generis*" (AAS 42 [1950] 561-578; read the texts which we cited in n.787, and T. Zapelena does not give sufficient attention to this fundamental distinction, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) 275-283.

tion from the ecclesiastical Magisterium, when they teach that the Magisterium of the Church, in order to define anything, presupposes both Scripture and Tradition as the sources, from which it draws the things it wants to define, as is certain from the decrees of *Trent* (D 1600, 1750, 1764, 1766) and *Vatican I* (D 3000, 3011, 3069-3070), and also from the notes of the Committee on Faith in the same *Vatican Council*: "For a dogmatic definition," it says, "it is necessary and sufficient that it is certain to the Fathers of the Council from the proper sources of divine revelation, namely, from Scripture and Tradition, that a certain truth is divinely revealed; and therefore that it is the office and task of the Fathers to declare and propose with authority this truth of the divine deposit according to its proper nature" (Msi 52,25). Pius XII makes the same distinction several times in the passages which we have cited in n.787. See n.760.

806. According to *Vatican Council I*, *Scripture and Tradition* are simply the written and handed down word of God, but the Magisterium is merely the guardian and explainer of the written and handed down word of God (D 3000, 3011f., 3020, 3069-3070). And therefore *Scripture and Tradition* are, and indeed by themselves, the remote Rule of faith for us; but the Magisterium is, not by itself but by reason of the word of God which it contains and declares, the proximate Rule of faith for us.

Finally, *Scripture and Tradition*, as the original sources of revelation, are the written and handed down word of God (D 3000, 3011). But Scripture is not properly a source of revelation if it is considered only actively, namely, inasmuch as it is formally an act of writing, but objectively inasmuch as the written word of God. Therefore similarly Tradition is not properly a source of revelation if it is looked at only actively, namely, inasmuch as it is formally an act of handing down, but rather objectively inasmuch as it is the handed down word of God.³⁰ For the deposit properly is said to be not the vase containing something, but the matter contained in the vase.

807. Objections.³¹ The primary source of revelation cannot be subject to corruption. But Tradition by its very nature is subject to corruption. Therefore the primary source of revelation cannot be Tradition.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. Human Tradition by its very nature is subject to corruption, *conceded*; divine, *I subdistinguish*: if it is left to human care and interpretation, *conceded*; if it is entrusted to the care and interpretation of the infallible Magisterium, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent.* The primary source of revelation cannot be human Tradition, *conceded*; divine, *I subdistinguish*: left to human care and interpretation, *conceded*; entrusted to the care and interpretation of the infallible Magisterium, *denied*.

808. 2. That which needs another is not the primary source of revelation. But tradition needs the infallible Magisterium. Therefore Tradition is not the primary source of revelation.

30. It seems to us that those authors are speaking inaccurately who, when they treat Tradition as a source of revelation, seem to reduce it to the living Magisterium of the Church. See Ch. Pesch, *Praelect.* 1 n.164; A. Deneffe, *Der Traditionsbegriff* (1931); T. Zapelena, *loc.cit.*, n.805.

31. See L. Muncunill, *De locis theol.* N.115-119; I. Müller, *De verbo Dei revelato* th.2 n.24-30; th.3 n.41-50.

I distinguish the major. That which needs another as a source of revelation in order to establish its own divine authority is not the primary source of revelation, *conceded*; which needs another as doctrinal authority in order to guard it and infallibly explain it for us, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Tradition needs the infallible Magisterium as a source of revelation in order to establish its own divine authority, *denied*; tradition needs the Magisterium as a doctrinal authority in order to guard it and infallibly explain it for us, *conceded*.

809. 3. Traditions in the N.T are openly rejected (Matt. 15:3; Gal. 1:14; 1 Pet. 1:18). Therefore it cannot be the primary source of revelation.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the N.T. divine traditions are rejected, *denied*; human traditions, *I subdistinguish*: impious, perverse or vain human traditions are rejected, *conceded*; human traditions in agreement with the will of God and the Gospel of Christ are rejected, *denied*.

810. 4. The books of holy Scripture are entirely sufficient (John 20:30f.; 2 Tim. 3:16f.). Therefore another source of revelation is not necessary.

I distinguish the antecedent. The books of Holy Scripture are entirely sufficient *relatively and positively*, or in reference to the end intended in them, *conceded*; *absolutely and exclusively* so that now another source of revelation is not to be admitted, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent:* Another source of revelation is not necessary *absolutely and under every respect*, *denied*; *relatively* or in reference to the truths about which with the help of the Magisterium it is sufficiently certain for us from Scripture, *I subdistinguish*: and still that other source must be admitted as ordained by God, *conceded*; and that other source must be rejected although it has been given to us by God superabundantly, *denied*.

811. 5. Holy Scripture contains the fullness of revelation (Gal. 1:8; Rev. 22:18). Therefore Tradition by reason of the fullness of Scripture does not surpass it.

I distinguish the antecedent. Scripture in the cited texts bears witness that nothing human should be added to the revelation given to us by the Apostles, and that it is not licit to remove anything from it, *conceded*; Scripture in the cited texts says that in itself all the per se revealed truths are contained, *denied*.

812. N.B. To solve the difficulties, which can be raised from the *Fathers*, one must pay attention to the context. Concerning the sayings of the Fathers, which usually are placed as objections, some are positive but others are exclusive, which however according to their mind can be explained rightly.³²

1) *The sayings of the Fathers*, in which they express *positively* the sufficiency of Holy Scripture and its fullness, generally are understood *not absolutely, but relatively*, in reference especially in order to explain *some particular or principle dogmas*.

2) *The sayings of the Fathers*, in which they seem to say that one must rely ex-

32. I. Müller, *loc.cit.*, th.2 n.31-35.

clusively on Scripture, in no way signify the negation of Tradition, but generally they intend to exclude either spurious or apocryphal scriptures, or vain arguments of human wisdom, or the impious traditions of men; or also in a polemical way they say that one must prescind from Tradition, because the adversaries, whom they are trying to convince, refuse to admit its validity.

CHAPTER V

On the criteria of Tradition

ARTICLE I

THE HOLY FATHERS ARE A CRITERION OF TRADITION

Thesis 20. The consensus of the holy Fathers in matters of faith and morals is a certain criterion of divine Tradition.

813. Franzelin, *De divina Traditione* th.13-16; Muncunill, *De locis* n.153-169; C. Schrader, *De theologico testium fonte* th.28-31; Bainvel, *De Magisterio vivo et Traditione* th.10; J.V. de Groot, *Summa Apologetica* q.20; R. Schultes, a.71; Dorsch, th.51; Dieckmann, th.33; Lercher, th.55; De Guibert, th.41; Cotter, th.39; Al.-Bárcena, p.199-211; Fessler-Jungmann, *Institutiones Patrologiae* t.1 c.1 § 9-16 p.26-57; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* 1 § 2 p.34-46; B. Steidle, *Patrologia* § 4; Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) th.21.

814. Connection. We have proved that divine Tradition is the primary *source* of revelation. We said that the *organs* of this divine Traditions are persons, to whom revelation in the Church is transmitted from the Apostles continuously down to us. We have shown that the *acts*, by which the organs of Tradition transmit revelation, can be reduced, according to St. Paul (1 Cor. 15:1f.11),¹ to the preaching and faith of the Church. Indeed this preaching and faith have produced some permanent effects, from which we can justly conclude what the Church preached and believed from the Apostles down to us. Among these monuments of Tradition the writings of the Fathers stand out. Hence we ask: What do these *writings of the holy Fathers* offer in order to know the divine Tradition?

815. Definition of terms. *The criterion* of Tradition is the norm by which the true Tradition can be detected and distinguished from the false.

a) *A primary criterion* is that which first and per se is established for the purpose of leading us directly to the handed down revelation: the *infallible Magisterium* is the primary criterion divinely instituted to guard, explain and define for us the revelation handed down in the Church from the Apostles.

b) *A secondary criterion* is that which, because of its connection with the primary criterion leads us indirectly to know the revelation handed down from the Apostles. Among these secondary criteria *the writings of*

1. St. Irenaeus agrees, *Adv. haeres.* 1,10,2; MG 7,552; and also St. Augustine, *Contra Iulianum* 6,5,11: ML 44,828.

the holy Fathers stand out.

These *criteria* are called *certain or probable*, according as they lead us certainly or only probably to discern the revelation handed on from the Apostles continuously in the Church.

816. *The secondary criteria* in order to recognize the revelation handed on continuously in the Church, 1) *are not absolutely necessary*, because in itself the authentic Magisterium is fully sufficient to attain this end aided by the divine assistance; 2) however, *they are very useful* so that the authentic Magisterium can explain and define more easily and more completely the deposit of faith; for, the divine assistance does not exclude human diligence in the use of the means leading to the knowledge of the handed down truth; 3) moreover, *they can be said to be necessary in a certain measure* so that theologians can demonstrate scientifically and positively that the deposit of faith has been faithfully preserved in the Church and faithfully transmitted from the Apostles to us, and also so that the subjective knowledge of the deposit of revelation may be obtained more profoundly and fully, and that it may be made more accessible to the minds of men with more suitable formulas.

817. *The Fathers of the Church in virtue of the word* are said to be those who, regarding the members of the Church, have a relationship similar to that which exists between a father and his son, that is, who generate the faithful and nourish them in Christ. They are 1) *the Apostles*, according to the saying of St. Paul: "For though you have countless guides in Christ, you do not have many *fathers*. For *I became your father* in Christ Jesus through the gospel" (1 Cor. 4:15). Hence the proper surname of the Church "Apostolic," borrowed from its first *Fathers*, the Apostles.

818. 2) *The Bishops* also rightly must be called *Fathers*, because as the successors of the Apostles they continually exercise their office of generating and forming the faithful in Christ as true Fathers. Therefore the people of Smyrna acclaimed St. Polycarp, the Bishop, saying: "He is the teacher of Asia, the Father of Christians." And Clement of Alexandria wrote in the same sense: "We call those fathers, who formed us in the catechism." Indeed, up until the time of St. Augustine only the Bishops were called Fathers, as can be deduced from the innovation which St. Augustine acknowledges when he numbers among the Fathers the *priest* St. Jerome in the year 421.²

819. 3) *The Fathers of the Church in the strict sense*, according to St. Vincent of Lérins, are the ecclesiastical authors, recognized by the Church

2. *Martyrium Polycarpi* 12,2: edi. Funk, *Pares Apostolici* t.1 p.329. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata* 1,1: MG 8,690; St. Augustine, *Contra Iulianum* 2,10,33f.37: R 1898-1900.

as orthodox, who are outstanding in doctrine, holiness and antiquity.³

a) They must be *ecclesiastical authors*, because only these can instruct the Church of future generations after their death.

b) It is necessary that they be *acknowledged by the Church as orthodox*, because otherwise they could not be used and recommended as certain leaders in order to learn the doctrine of revelation. But this recognition by the Church can take two forms: one *explicit*, according to what Pope Celestine and Pope Gelasius said about St. Augustine and about several Fathers in his famous *Decree* (D 237, 352-354); but the other *implicit*, which takes place either by the use of the authentic Magisterium, or the common praxis in the Church, when the ordinary pastors of the Churches know about authors and do not contradict them.

820. c) It is necessary that they be, at least relatively, *outstanding in doctrine*, because they are used to get to know the deposit of faith better and to explain it more clearly. If they make a few errors which are not of great importance, they are still not opposed to the loftiness of the doctrine, which we require. For some errors of this kind can be detected in almost all the Fathers, even those explicitly acknowledged by the Church.

d) It is fitting that they be *preeminent in holiness*, because other things being equal, holiness contributes very much both to better perception of divine things and to handing them on to the faithful.

e) Finally, they should belong to antiquity, at least relatively, according as it seems to agree with the notion itself of a Father. Actually, the age of the Fathers can be considered to be completed *by the middle of the 8th century*: that is, for the East about the year 750 with St. John Damascene, but for the West in the year 735 with St. Bede the Venerable.⁴

Because of their excellent gifts the holy Fathers above all are those men who, as Eusebius of Caesarea describes them in his *Ecclesiastical History*, "in the various ages were ministers of the divine word orally and in writing, and in their writings the tradition of the apostolic doctrine has come down to us."⁵

821. *The concept of holy Fathers differs from the notion:*

3. St. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium* 28: R 2175. See J. Madoz, *El concepto de la Tradición en S. Vicente de Lerins* (1933) c.4 § 2; Id., *El Common. de S. V. de Lerins* (1935).
4. For the various opinions on this point see the *Patrologies*. For the *East*, they commonly place the end of the age of the Fathers at the death of St. John Damascene; for the *West*, several prefer its end in the year 636 with St. Isidore of Spain, but several others locate it in the year 604 with St. Gregory the Great.
5. Eusebius Caesariensis, *Historia ecclesiastica* 1,1,1; 3,37,4; 4,21; 5,22: MG 20,48.293.377.489. See J. Salaverri, *El origen de la revelación y los garantes de su conservación en la Iglesia según Eusebio de Cesarea*: Greg 16 (1935) 349-373.

1) *Of Christian writers*, who are said to be men pertaining to some of the Christian confessions, and outstanding in matters concerning Christianity. In these there can be found, but they are not required, an ecclesiastical character, but neither orthodoxy, nor holiness, nor antiquity: writers who can be called such, for example, are Marcion, Harnack, and others.

2) *Of ecclesiastical writers*, who are men of the Church outstanding in erudition concerning Christian matters. In these there can be found, but they are not required, orthodoxy recognized by the Church, but no holiness or antiquity. In the patristic age some who fit into this category are Aristides, Tatian, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Arnobius, Lactantius, Eusebius of Caesarea, Didymus of Alexandria, Rufinus, and others.

822. 3) *Of doctors of the Church*: These are ecclesiastical authors, recognized by the Church as distinguished both in holiness of life and in orthodoxy of doctrine, *and expressly honored with the title of "Doctor" by the Supreme Pontiff*. In them there can be, but it is not required, antiquity; however, for anyone to be able to be called a Doctor of the Church, besides the excellence of doctrine, holiness and orthodoxy, the *explicit recognition of the Church is required and the conferring of the title of Doctor by the Supreme Pontiff*.

823. There are 29 *Doctors of the Church* named by the Roman Pontiffs: by *Boniface VIII*, in 1295, Saints Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome and Gregory the Great; by *Pius V*, in 1567, St. Thomas Aquinas, in 1568, Saints Athanasius, Basil, John Chrysostom and Gregory Nazianzen; by *Sixtus V*, in 1588, St. Bonaventure; by *Clement IX*, in 1720, St. Anselm; by *Innocent XIII*, in 1722, St. Isidore of Spain; by *Benedict XIII*, in 1729, St. Peter Chrysologus; by *Benedict XIV*, in 1754, St. Leo the Great; by *Leo XII*, in 1828, St. Peter Damian; by *Pius VIII*, in 1830, St. Bernard; by *Pius IX*, in 1851, St. Hilary of Poitiers, in 1871, St. Alphonse Maria de Liguori, in 1877, St. Francis de Sales; by *Leo XIII*, in 1882, Saints Cyril of Alexandria and Cyril of Jerusalem, in 1890, St. John Damascene, in 1899, St. Bede the Venerable; by *Benedict XV*, in 1920, St. Ephraem of Syria; by *Pius XI*, in 1925, St. Peter Canisius, in 1926, St. John of the Cross, in 1931, St. Robert Bellarmine, in 1932, St. Albert the Great; by *Pius XII*, in 1946, St. Anthony of Padua. Of these 29 Doctors, 21 are from the Western Church, 8 from the Eastern Church; 14 from the secular clergy, 15 from the clerks regular; 2 Roman Pontiffs, 3 Cardinal Bishops, 15 Bishops, 8 Priests, 1 Deacon (St. Ephraem).

824. We require the *objective* and *certain* consensus of the Fathers, and indeed of *all of them*, not physically but at least *morally*.

In matters of faith and morals, that is, in matters pertaining to the deposit of revelation, because the Fathers can agree: 1) *As private Doctors* or as *purely historic witnesses*, which is easily made clear, either from their intention, when they propose an opinion that is either personal or freely

debated, or from the object, since the matter they are treating does not pertain to the deposit of revelation. We are not considering consensus in these affairs. 2) *As authentic Doctors* the Fathers can agree, when they teach or preach authoritatively a doctrine to their flocks as necessary to believe or to hold: but *only the Bishops* among the Doctors can do this. 3) *As witnesses to the faith* the Fathers can agree, when they bear witness that a doctrine is to be believed by the Church as something revealed.

825. State of the question. For the consensus of the Fathers to be certain, we require the criterion of Tradition so that they speak about matters of faith or morals as witnesses to the faith and as authentic doctors, and that their consensus be objective, certain and morally unanimous.

826. Adversaries. 1) *By defect* they are opposed: a) *Protestants*, since they hold that the only criterion of revealed truth is Holy Scripture; b) *Rationalists* and *Modernists*, who say that the only criterion of religious truth is natural reason or a religious sense dictating to each person what must be held in religious matters. These adversaries have already been answered in the preceding thesis.

2) *By excess* the *Jansenists* are opposed, who have exaggerated too much the authority of St. Augustine: D 2330.⁶

827. Doctrine of the Church. 1) *Practically* the consensus of the holy Fathers has been used in the *Ecumenical Councils* in matters of faith and morals as a certain and definitive criterion. Thus, for example, in *the Council of Ephesus*: D 251, in *Chalcedon*: D 301, in *Constantinople III*: D 556, in *Nicaea II*: D 602. From the history of these Councils it is certain that many testimonies of the holy Fathers were collected together and used; having relied on them in a special way, the Bishops worked out the conciliar definitions: the words of the definitions, which allude to the testimonies of the Fathers, are a sign or trace of this way of proceeding.⁷ *The Council of Trent* appeals often to the consensus of the holy Fathers as a criterion to discern the truth in matters of faith and morals: D 1600, 1750, 1766, 1820. To this can be added the definitions of Martin I (in 649) and Agatho (in 680): D 501-522, 548, 554-555, 556.

2) *Theoretically* the consensus of the holy Fathers, at least in matters of faith and morals, is used as a certain criterion for the interpretation of Holy

6. See Pius XI, Encyclical "*Ad salute*": AAS 22 (1930) 202-204.

7. See J. Salaverri, *El argumento de Tradición patristica en la Antigua Iglesia*: RevEspT 5 (1945) 107-119; Id., *La idea de Tradición en la "Historia eclesiástica de Eusebio"*: Greg 13 (1932) 211-240.

Scripture by the Councils of *Trent* and *Vatican I*: D 1507, 1689, 1863, 3007.

828. Theological note. The doctrine which the thesis states can be said to be *implicitly defined*, especially in the Councils of *Chalcedon*, *Constantinople III*, *Trent* and *Vatican I*.

829. Proof. The consensus of the Fathers in matters of faith and morals is so intimately connected with the teaching Church that error in the consensus of the Fathers would introduce error into the Universal Church. But the Universal Church in matters of faith and morals cannot err. Therefore the consensus of the Fathers in matters of faith and morals is a certain criterion of divine Tradition.

The minor is certain from the theses on the infallibility of the Church.

830. *The major* is proved: 1) **With reference to the Church during the patristic age.**

a) *On the holy Fathers as witnesses of faith:* The consensus of the Fathers attesting that a doctrine is to be believed by the Church as revealed, is a testimony so excellent in *knowledge* because of the teaching, in *veracity* because of the holiness, in *extension* because of the numbers, and in *worth* because of the quality of the witnesses, that if it were false, the knowing and silent Church in no way would permit it. But such testimony permanently and evidently is given in their writings, while the Church knows it, does not contradict it and in fact also agrees with it. Therefore, the consensus of the Fathers attesting that a doctrine is to be believed by the Church as revealed is so intimately connected with the teaching Church that error in the consensus of the Fathers would introduce error into the Universal Church.

831. b) *On the holy Fathers as authentic Doctors:* The consensus of the Fathers *authoritatively* teaching their flocks a doctrine as *necessarily to be believed or held* has such great weight because of their knowledge, holiness and episcopal office that, if it were erroneous, the other Pastors of the Church and especially the *Roman Pontiffs*, knowing about this, in no way could remain silent and permit it. But as their exchange of letters demonstrates, the other Pastors of the Church, when teaching authoritatively, carefully consulted and followed them in doctrine, indeed also the Supreme Pontiffs in a very special way fostered union and communication in doctrine with these Fathers. Therefore the consent of the Fathers authoritatively teaching their flocks a doctrine as *necessarily to be believed or held*, is so intimately

connected with the teaching Church, that error in the consent of the Fathers would argue error in the Universal Church.

832. *The major is proved:* 2) **With reference to the Church during the ages from the middle of the 5th century up to the end of the 19th century.**

The Church from the middle of the 5th century united together in the *Ecumenical Councils* diligently sought and followed the consensus of the holy Fathers in matters of faith and morals in order to declare and define the doctrine of faith or morals. Therefore the consent of the Fathers in matters of faith or morals is so intimately connected with the teaching Church that error in the consent of the Fathers would introduce error into the Universal Church.

The *antecedent* is clear from what we said above when we explained the doctrine of the Church concerning this thesis. Furthermore, the *antecedent* is certain from the history of the Ecumenical Councils, in which the method was used of defining the dogmas "according to the teaching of the holy Fathers," and this method was assiduously cultivated already by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431.⁸ Therefore St. Vincent of Lérins, while briefly recalling what was done in *Action #1 of the Council of Ephesus*, rightly says: to the Bishops at the Synod of Ephesus "it was divinely pleasing, to decree nothing else for posterity to believe except what the sacred antiquity of the holy Fathers held, who agreed with each other in Christ."⁹

833. The same *antecedent* in particular can be proved wonderfully by an important fact of the history of antiquity, namely, by the condemnation of *Monotheletism*. For, the Monotheletists in the years 649 and 680 in the *Lateran* and *Roman Councils* were rejected by the Supreme Pontiffs Martin I and Agatho, especially because of the innumerable testimonies of the holy Fathers found to be against them (D 501-522, 548). But afterwards, in the year 681, at the *Council of Constantinople III*, the same Monotheletists were condemned especially because of the testimonies of the holy Fathers, which Pope St. Agatho added to his dogmatic epistle sent to the Council through his legates and acknowledged with unanimous applause by the Fathers of the Council: D 548, 554-555, 556.¹⁰

8. Msi 4,1183. See *loc.cit.*: RevEspT 5 (1945) 111-119.

9. St. Vincent of Lérins, *Commonitorium* 33: ML 50,684f. See J. Madoz, *loc.cit.*, in note 3 c.4. Several authors, and with them recently Zapelena, 2 (1954) p.291, usually attribute these words to the *Council of Ephesus* itself; but this is not correct, as we have proved in EstEcl 19 (1945) 381-386: *Sentencia falsamente atribuida al Concilio de Efeso*. See J. Harduini, *Conciliorum collection* 1, 1399-1422.

10. See *loc.cit.*: RevEspT 5 (1945) 117-119.

834. The thesis can be *confirmed* by an argument of reason taken from *the nature itself of such consent considered in itself*. For, consensus in doctrine of so many men outstanding for their talent and sincerity, in the most diverse circumstances of affairs and opposition, and also often given under the risk of death, cannot be explained except from the truth itself which is known for certain, according to the principle of natural reason well expressed by Tertullian in these words: "But what is found as one among many is not an error, but handed on."¹¹ Therefore the consensus of the holy Fathers in matters of faith and morals is a certain criterion of divine Tradition.

835. Finally, the holy Fathers themselves in affirming the truth of the thesis agree with us. St. Basil: "Not to insist on following the footsteps of the Fathers, and not to follow their strong voice in one's own opinion is something worthy of rebuke as the peak of arrogance."¹² St. Augustine: R 1898-1900. Theodoret: R 2142. St. Vincent of Lérins: R 2168 at the end and 2175.¹³

836. Scholium.¹⁴ Conditions required for a true argument from the consent of the Fathers.

1) The authors often, especially in the manuals, argue only *from the authority* rather than from the consent of the Fathers; for, they quote some fragments of the Fathers, in which the same doctrine is asserted which they are defending. But this is nothing other than to confirm a doctrine from the authority of the Fathers who are cited.

837. 2) But the *argument from the consent of the holy Fathers* as based on the certain criterion of divine Tradition is much more difficult, but it can be reduced to this one form: The holy Fathers certainly teach this or that doctrine. But such a doctrine is marked by three conditions: A) it is a doctrine of faith or morals, B) the Fathers teach it as witnesses of the faith or as authentic doctors, C) they also hold it with a morally unanimous consensus. Therefore, such a doctrine certainly comes from the divine Tradition of the Apostles. These three points in each case must be proved in order to have a true argument from the consent of the Fathers, which we are now considering.

838. *The major* must be proved by the scientific, positive-historical method; that is, it must be proved that this or that doctrine certainly is taught by the individual Fathers: a) *from their text which is critically genuine, not spurious, integral, not mutilated or interpolated, original, not translated into another language* unless there is certainty about the faithfulness of the translation; b) *in the full context* of their works, not just in fragments separated from the context; c) *it fits in suitably with the purpose and character of the works to which the texts pertain*; d) *according to the various*

11. Tertullian, *De praescriptione* 28: ML 2,47.

12. St. Basil, *Epistg.* 52,1: MG 32,391.

13. See J. Madoz, *loc.cit.*, in note 9; and G. Mártel, *La tradición en S. Agustín* (1943).

14. See Pesch, *Institutiones* 1 n.581-587; De Groot, q.20 a.3; Muncunill, *De locis* n.168f.; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.66-76; Schultes, a.61 § 7-9; Lercher, n.537-542.

philosophical, historical and religious *presuppositions of the individual Fathers*; e) according to the real meaning which the terms and sentences have in the mind of the holy Fathers. Surely this proof often can be presupposed completely or partially made already by the critical editions, by *Patrology*, by the *History of Dogmas*, and by *Theology* whether positive or historical.¹⁵

839. *The minor* also must be proved by parts.

A. In the first place it is necessary to prove that the doctrine one is dealing with is *doctrine on faith or morals* and also not considered merely objectively in itself, but especially subjectively in the mind of the holy Fathers who are teaching it; for in profane matters pertaining either to philosophy, or to the natural sciences, or to history, the authority of the Fathers is thought to be only as valuable as the weight of the reasons with which their assertions are proved.¹⁶

B. Then it is necessary to prove that the same doctrine is proposed by the Fathers not as private teachers, but as *witnesses of faith* or as *authentic doctors*, and therefore not by merely inquiring, doubting or supposing, but certainly and without doubt holding it; for if they teach something while having doubt about it or just supposing, although this may be the case with several Fathers, as happened before the 4th century concerning the opinion about a *Thousand Year Kingdom*, then their teaching should be considered as a free opinion about which one is permitted to debate.¹⁷

C. Finally, the *morally unanimous consensus* of the Fathers on holding the same doctrine must be proved. But this can be done in two ways: namely, directly and indirectly.

840. 1) *Directly* by inquiring earnestly into the doctrine of each of the Fathers; if it is discovered that they agree, then it provides an invincible and full argument from their unanimous consensus as from a certain criterion of divine Tradition.

2) *Indirectly* and also for several reasons: a) By demonstrating *directly* the consensus of the *Western Fathers*, and from that by concluding *indirectly* to the consensus of the *Eastern Fathers also*; because it cannot happen that in matters of faith and morals the Fathers of the Eastern Church do not agree with the Fathers of the Western Church, which is under the immediate vigilance of the Supreme Pontiff. b) By proving *directly* the consensus of *some outstanding Fathers of East and West*, for example, of Athanasius, Hilary, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Epiphanius and Augustine, and from that by concluding *indirectly* to the consensus of *all the Fathers*; because, as history shows, in matters of faith and morals the other Fathers of the Church generally agree with these very outstanding men. c) By showing *directly* the consensus of *all the Fathers of a certain age*, and from that concluding *indirectly* to the consensus

15. The principles of this positive method are excellently explained by D. Petavius, *De theologicis dogmatibus* (1644) t.1 prologue. Leo XIII commends Petavius as an "eminent man" in the Encyclical "*Depuis le jour*" sent to the Bishops of France: ASS 32 (1899) 197.

16. M. Cano, *De locis theologicis* l.7 c.3 concl.1.^a

17. *De Millenarismo*, see Franzelin, *De divina Traditione* th.16. See out thesis 7, Scholium 2, n.314-317. See J. Sagüés, SthS 4,6 n.324-334.

of the Fathers of the remaining ages; for, because of the Church's indefectibility in matters of faith and morals it cannot happen that the whole Church of one age does not agree with the whole Church of the seven prior centuries. d) By demonstrating *some main article of doctrine from one or other Father*, who is recognized by the Church as *the leader in the defense of this doctrine against the heretics*, as was Athanasius against the *Arians*, Augustine against the *Pelagians*, Cyril of Alexandria against the *Nestorians*, and from that by concluding *indirectly* to the consent of the other Fathers; because, as the history of dogmas shows, the other Fathers together with the whole Church applauded these outstanding men for their defense of dogma.

841. 3) *In the interpretation of Holy Scripture*, in order to obtain an argument from consent of the Fathers that is a certain criterion of divine Tradition, it is required first of all that certainty is established, not only that the Fathers agree on this interpretation, but also that they propose it as the meaning that for the sacred author is divinely inspired; for, often the holy Fathers attribute to the sacred text a meaning that is fitting for the rhetorical or ascetical effect which they have in mind. But when this is the case, the argument from the consent of the Fathers in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, in order for it to be a true criterion of divine Tradition, must assume the same conditions, which we just mentioned above. And therefore, namely, from a lack of some of the given conditions, it is properly explained why contemporary exegetes can depart from the consensus of the Fathers in the interpretation of some texts of Scripture: for example, Gen. 7:2.13.23 on the extent of the flood; Isa. 53:8 on the birth of Christ; Heb. 6:4-6 on Baptism.¹⁸

842. Objections.¹⁹ 1. The authority of the Fathers, according to the argument, is founded on the authority of the Church. But the authority of the Church is proved from the authority of the Fathers. Therefore there is a vicious circle in the proof.

I distinguish the antecedent. The theological or dogmatic authority of the Fathers is founded on the authority of the Church; but the authority of the Church is proved from the *historical or apologetic* authority of the Fathers, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent.* It would be a vicious circle, if the authority of the Fathers were taken under the same respect, *conceded*; if it is taken under a different respect, *denied*.

2. On the authority of the Fathers St. Augustine says: "But I read the other [authors] in such a way that, no matter how much holiness or learning they may have, I do not therefore consider what they have said to be true." And St. Thomas said: "Sacred doctrine uses the authorities of the other doctors of the Church, as it were by arguing from what is proper to them, but with probability." From these quotes I argue thus: The authority of the Fathers offers an argument that is merely persuasive or only probable. Therefore the consensus of the Fathers is not a certain criterion of divine

18. C. Pesch, *Institutiones* 1 n.585-587; De Groot, q.20 a.3 n.2; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.68; A. Bea, *Il progresso nell'interpretazione della S. Scrittura*: Greg 33 (1952) 85-105.

19. Io. Muncunill, *De locis* n.162-164; De Groot, q.20 a.1; Schultes, a.61 n.8; Cotter, th.39; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1921) 586-592.

Tradition.²⁰

I admit the testimonies and also point out that, in the quoted texts, they are not speaking about the *dogmatic* authority of the *consensus* of the Fathers, but about the *scientific* authority of individuals or of a few Fathers. Hence *I distinguish the antecedent*: the *scientific authority of individuals or of a few Fathers* offers a merely persuasive or only probable argument, *I bypass the antecedent*; the *dogmatic authority of the consensus* of the Fathers, *denied*.

843. 3. The Fathers as fallible men often erred. Therefore a certain criterion cannot be derived from them.

I distinguish the antecedent. As private Doctors or as historical witnesses, *conceded*; as authentic Doctors or as dogmatic witnesses, *I subdistinguish*: dissenting, *conceded*; agreeing according to the conditions assigned in the thesis, *denied*.

4. The agreeing Fathers held the system of Ptolemy and other false doctrines of this kind. Therefore the agreeing Fathers also erred.

I distinguish the antecedent. The agreeing Fathers held false doctrines concerning profane things, *conceded*; concerning matters of faith and morals, *denied*.

844. 5. The agreeing Fathers held false doctrines on *Millenarism* and on the *delay of the vision of God* for just souls until the day of judgment. Therefore the agreeing Fathers held false doctrines on matters of faith and morals.

I distinguish the antecedent. The consensus of the Fathers in such doctrines was informed by the necessary conditions, *denied*; it was lacking the necessary conditions, *I subdistinguish*: and this consent concerned an opinion which the Fathers proposed as *absolutely certain* and as something to be *absolutely held* by all the faithful, *denied*; as solidly probable which could be held safely by the faithful, *conceded*.

On Millenarism recall what we said in numbers 314-317. *On the delay of the Beatific Vision* until the day of the last judgment, a) *consensus is lacking*, for, that just and fully cleansed souls enjoy the vision of God without any delay was taught by St. Clement of Rome, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, St. Cyprian, St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Jerome and others²¹; b) those who taught such a delay, propose it, not as a completely certain opinion and as something absolutely to be held, but as probable and safe, like St. Ambrose, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Augustine and others.²² Here are the words of St. Augustine in the cited place: "Who those blessed ones are, who are now in possession of it, *is a great question*. Concerning the holy angels who are there, there is no question. But the *question is rightly raised* about the holy men who have already died. For, they have already departed from the corruptible body, by which the

20. St. Augustine, *Ad Hieronymum Epist.* 82 c.1 n.3: ML 33,277; S.Th. I, q. 1 a. 8 ad 2.

21. St. Clement of Rome, *Epist. Ad Cor.* N.5-6 (edit. Funk, *Patres Apostolici* 1,104); St. Ignatius, *Epist. Ad Rom.* n. 4 (Funk, *loc.cit.*, 256); St. Polycarp, *Epist. Ad Philip.* n.9 (Funk, *loc.cit.*, 306); St. Cyprian, *De mortalitate* n.26; *Ad Fortunatum* c.13: ML 4,601-674; St. Basil, *Homil. De gratiar. actione* n.3 and 7; *Homil. In quadrag. Martyr.* n.8: MG 31,226.234.522; St. Greg. Nazianzen, *Homil. VII in laudem Caesarii fratris* n.21: MG 35,782; St. Jerome, *Ad Marcellam Epist.* 23 n.3: ML 22,426.

22. St. Ambrose, *Ad Anatholium Epist.* 15 n.4: ML 16,997; St. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio in funere Pulcheriae*: MG 46,870; St. Augustine, *Retractationes* l.1 c.14 n.2: ML 32,606; St. Bernard, *Epist.* 374 n.2: ML 182,579.

soul is aggravated, but they still also are waiting for the redemption of their body, and their flesh rests in hope, not yet shining with the future incorruption. But whether they contemplate the truth with the eyes of the heart, as had been said, *face to face*, it is difficult to say *and this is not the place to inquire into it by debating it.*"

ARTICLE II

THE CONSENSUS OF THEOLOGIAN IS ALSO A
CRITERION OF TRADITION**Thesis 21. The consensus of theologians in matters of faith and morals is a certain criterion of divine Tradition.**

845. Franzelin, *De Traditione* th.17; Pesch, *Instit.* 1 th.55; Id., *Compend.* 1 th.45; De Groot, q.21 a.1; Muncunill, *De locis* n.170-176; Dorsch, p.748-753; Schultes, a.72; Dieckmann, n.880; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* th.11 n.77-90; De Guibert, th.42; Lercher, th.56; Cotter, th.40; Alonso-Bárcena, *De Ecclesiae Magisterio* th.19.

846. Connection. In the preceding thesis we proved that the consent of the holy Fathers is a criterion of divine Tradition, from the intimate relations which exist between such consent and the authentic Magisterium of the Church. Since history shows that similar relations also exist between the Magisterium of the Church and the consensus of Theologians, for this reason we have formulated this thesis.

847. Definition of terms. What a criterion is and consent, and the conditions that qualify them, along with the matter of faith and morals concerning which they must deal, these points are sufficiently clear from the preceding thesis. Now the notion of a *Theologian* must be spelled out in detail.

Theologians are persons who have cultivated the knowledge of divine things, deducing them from the sources of revelation. Under this general notion, both Catholic and non-Catholic Theologians are included. The *non-Catholic* Theologians are said to be those who strive to deduce the knowledge of divine things from the sources of revelation motivated by *the light of reason alone* and by philosophic-historical criteria. *Catholic Theologians* are those who derive the knowledge of divine things from the sources of revelation by a *scientific*, philosophic-historical *method*, however they do it by *the light of reason illuminated by faith* and aided by the authentic Magisterium of the Church as the supreme criterion.

848. *Catholic Theologians*, as they have been defined by us, in the history of Theology are said to belong to three ages of the Church: The first is the *age of the holy fathers*, from the beginning of the Church to St. John Damascene in the middle of the 8th century; the second is the *middle age*, from St. Bede, before the middle of the 8th century, to the beginning of the 16th century; the third is the *new age*, from the *Council of Trent*, before the

middle of the 16th century, to our own times. Within each of these three ages a flourishing period of about 100 years is deservedly pointed out: in the first, *after the Council of Nicaea I*, in the year 325; in the second, *after Lateran Council IV*, in the year 1215; in the third, *after the Council of Trent*, in the year 1563. In each period of splendor one Theologian can also be singled out, who for a special reason stands out among the others: in the first, St. Augustine; in the second, St. Thomas Aquinas; in the third, so far, Francis Suarez.¹

849. *Theologians*, in the more *strict sense*, are the men who, after the age of the holy Fathers, having been enlightened by faith and guided by the Magisterium of the Church, *in an eminent way* have treated the sacred doctrine, especially in written books. The argument from Theologians is taken de facto from their writings, and so in this thesis we are dealing especially with Theologians who are authors.

850. Those men, especially monks, are called *compiling Theologians*, who from the end of the patristic age to the end of the 11th century, preserved the collected works of the holy Fathers briefly into one body in order to preserve them from destruction in the turbulent times of the middle ages. For, at that time, the monasteries above all became almost the only safe refuge for the sciences; then also the Cathedrals of the Churches, especially in places where Charlemagne commanded that studies be instituted. Hence the most famous centers of study from the 9th century on were located in Tours, Orléans, Reims, Corbie, St. Gall, Reichenau, Fulda, Cluny, Hildesheim, Paderborn, Bec, Paris.²

851. Those are called *scholastic Theologians* who, since the 12th century, have striven to coordinate sacred doctrine with the help of Philosophy into one system and to accommodate it more to the power of reason. They are called *Scholastics*, because this way of analyzing and handing on sacred doctrine was born and developed in the public schools of the middle ages; for the most part they were established by the authority of the Church or at least they flourished under her careful directed and vigilance, especially is that the case with the Universities. After the schools of the Monks and Clerics the *Universities* were born, of which the most ancient of all, and which the other imitated, were those of Paris and Bonn; both of them were

1. M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katholischen Theologie* (1933) 14f.

2. K. Kirch, *Leitfaden der Kirchengeschichte. Das Mittelalter* § 139; D. Reichling, *Dom- und Klosterschulen des Mittelalters: Lexikon der Pädagogik* 1, 894-898; J. Salaverri, *Vitalidad y actualidad perenne de la Iglesia en su misión educadora: RevEspT* 9 (1949) 223-264.

instituted and governed, from the end of the 12th century, by ecclesiastical men and in order to promote the doctrine of the Church: at Paris the main emphasis was on Theology, but at Bonn it was on Church law. In imitation of these, others in the 13th and 14th centuries were established at Oxford, Salamanca, Toulouse, Rome, Cambridge, Padua, Orleans, Pisa, Vienna, Cologne, Valladolid, Coimbra, etc.³

852. St. Isidore of Spain and St. John Damascene are *Theologians* at the end of the patristic age, who attempted to reduce to a system the sacred doctrine of the holy Fathers for the use of the schools. The *Libri tres Sententiarum* of Isidore and the *Expositio fidei orthodoxae* of Damascene were the principal books as texts in order to learn Theology in the Schools before the middle of the 11th century—the work of Isidore in the West and of Damascene in the East. Isidore assembled his theses especially from St. Augustine, but Damascene from St. Gregory Nazianzen.⁴

853. In the middle of the 11th century St. Anselm “was raised up by God to point out by his example, his words, and his writings, the safe road... and to be the guide and rule of those Catholic teachers who after him taught the sacred letters by the method of the school, and who thus came rightly to be esteemed and celebrated as their precursor.”⁵ St. Anselm in his works treated the principal dogmas in such a way that he made it easier for those who came after him to compose a perfect system of Dogmatic Theology.

854. From the 12th century to the middle of the 13th century several authors attempted to produce this perfect system of Theology, with works that are designated with two different titles, namely, *Books of Sentences* and *Summaries* (*Libri sententiarum* et *Summae*). In the form of the Books of Sentences, those who obtained greater perfection and exercised the greatest influence on posterity were Hugo of St. Victor (+ 1141) with his work *De Sacramentis christianae fidei* and especially Peter Lombard (+ 1160) with his *Sententiarum libri quatuor* (1150-1152); this famous work

3. K. Bihlmeyer, *Universitäten: Kirchl. Handlexikon* 2,2507-2511; H. Schenkl, *Universitäten: Lexikon der Pädagogik* 5,309-311; F. Pelsner, *Universitäten: LTK* 10,405-408; E. Horn, *Universitäten: REPT* 20,266-282.

4. St. Isidore, *Libri tres sententiarum*: ML 83,538-738; Stg. John Damascene, *De fide orthodoxa*: Έκδοσις ἀκριβής τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως: MG 94,782.789.1228. In the Greek manuscripts the work of Damascene is divided into three books. After the time of P. Lombard it was divided into four books. Samuel Taius, the Bishop of Saragossa, after St. Isidore, in the same 7th century, produced the *Sententiarum libri quinque*. See Z. García Villada, *Hist. eclesiast. de España* t.2 p.2 c.17 § 3 p.217-223 and c.13 p.160-161; M. Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* 1,144-146; Id., *Geschichte der kathol. Theologie* 23.

5. Pius X, Encyclical “*Communium rerum*”: AAS 1 (1909) 377f.

merited for it author the title "Master of the Sentences." It was used by the greatest Theologians as the text for teaching Theology until the end of the 16th century and it was illustrated by many commentaries.⁶

855. In the form of Summaries, the works that stand out especially are those of Alexander of Hales (+ 1245), *Summa Theologiae* divided into four parts, and the *Summa Theologiae* (1267-1273) of St. Thomas Aquinas, divided into three parts. With the approach of death, what the Angelic Doctor was not able to write on Penance, Extreme Unction, Order, Matrimony and the Last Things, seems to have been added as a Supplement according to the lectures of Reginald Pipernensis, in the year 1280, based on the *Commentaries* of St. Thomas on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard. In the *Summa* St. Thomas, with the marvelous power of his talent, knew how to use the Philosophy of Aristotle in order to construct a theological system so perfect that in it a summary is obtained of the harmony between faith and reason, in opposition to the antinomy of reason against faith defended by Averroes; and after so many centuries the hope still remains unfulfilled of finding another theological system, which could be said to be more perfect than his. Since the 16th century among the great theologians there have been countless commentaries on the *Summa* of St. Thomas; among them those who stand out especially from the *Order of Preachers* are Capreolus, Cajetan, Báñez, John of St. Thomas; from the *Order of Carmelites* the so-called *Salmanticenses*; from the *Society of Jesus* Toledo, Valentia, Suarez, Vázquez.⁷

856. The so-called *Theological Schools* were born after the middle of the 13th century, when speculative Theology began to flourish. Their diversity had its beginning not from different views of dogma, but from a different systematic ordering of revealed truths, and especially from the different rational explanations of dogmas and adoption of systematic philosophies. The main *Theological Schools*, because of the condition of the principal Theologians belonging to them, have been called *Dominican*,

6. Hugo of St. Victor, *De Sacramentis christianae fidei*: ML 176,173-618; P. Lombard, *Sententiarum libri quatuor*: ML 192,521-962. In Lombard's work opinions taken from St. Augustine are by far the most prevalent, so that if we divide the work into ten parts, nine of them would be Augustinian: J. de Ghellinck, *Mouvement théologique du XII^e siècle* (1914) 145-147; Id., *Pierre Lombard*: DTC 12,1989; Grabmann, *Gesch. Der scholast. Methode* 2,385-387. "The systems of Hugo of St. Victor and A. of Hales de facto are nothing more than elaborations of the theological insights handed down by St. Augustine": Grabmann, *Gesch. der kathol. Theologie* 22.

7. M. Grabmann, *Einführung in die "Summa Theologiae des h. Thomas von Aquin* (1928) 8-49; Id., *Gesch. der katho. Theol.* 63-66, 75-84. On the authors who dispute the genuineness of the *Summa* of A. of Hales, see Grabmann, *Gesch. der kathol. Theol.* 296 § 4. See Suermondt, *De textu critico leonino Sum. Theol. S. Th. Summa*, ed. P. Caramello 1 p.V-XIV.

Franciscan, Augustinian, Carmelite, Jesuit, etc.; because of the name of the Theologian who obtained predominance in each school, they were called *Thomistic, Scotist, Occhamistic, Suarezian*, etc. These names of Schools, although they are characteristic, still cannot be said to be adequate or exclusive; for, the *School* that is called *Jesuit*, truly and properly should be called *Thomistic*, and it differs from the *Dominican* only with regard to the manner, inasmuch as, being strengthened by a more ample exegetic-patristic erudition, it strives to fecundate more and develop further the Thomistic doctrine; also, in those things that can be disputed, it exercises greater autonomy and freedom of opinion.⁸

857. From this *historical overview* it is clearly certain: 1) *For Theologians* that *Antiquity* is not required, which we demanded for the holy Fathers; in fact, Theologians come after the age of the Fathers. 2) That *Holiness* is not required, although this is in no way excluded, since several of the Theologians are really Saints. 3) That the approval of the Church is not required, at least the common type which the holy Fathers obtained; however, this approbation is not excluded, for many of them, especially those who have been proclaimed *Doctors of the Church*, are honored with true Church approval. 4) A certain *eminence of doctrine* manifested in writings is required *positively for Theologians*. 5) Also *orthodoxy* of doctrine is required, at least to this extent recognized by the Church that their writings are used by the faithful and the schools, with the knowledge of and with no opposition from the Magisterium of the Church.

858. State of the question. For the *consensus of Theologians* to be a certain criterion of divine Tradition, we require that they be *Catholic Theologians* in the strict sense, that they excel in *eminence and orthodoxy* of doctrine, that they write *about matters of faith or morals* either as *witnesses of the faith* of the Church or as doctors, if not authentic, at least by proving their assertions with convincing arguments, so that their *consensus* may be *objective, morally unanimous* and expressed *with a certain conviction*.

859. Adversaries. Roger Bacon, O.F.M. (1214-1294), who by using the empirical method discovered the physical laws of the reflection of light and refraction, but he inveighed bitterly against the scholastic method. *The promoters of Humanism*, showing more than just esteem for literature and

8. For the characteristic notes of the *Theological Schools*, see M. Grabmann, *Gesch. der kathol. Theol.* 60-73, 92-115; Id., *Einführung in die "Summa"* 45f. On the freedom which the Church approves of adhering to any of these Schools, which have justly acquired their home in the Church, see Pius XII, *Allocution "Animus Noster"*: AAS 45 (1953) 684-687; see F. Pelster: *EstEcl* 27 (1953) 143-166; below n.880-883.

the classical arts, directed many violent reproaches against the scholastics, whom with contempt they called "barbarians" because they neglected the use of a literary style.

Wycliffe and the leading *Protestants* are adversaries; they directed so many insults against the Scholastics that the very name "Scholastic" became among them a synonym for vacuous, fallacious and useless knowledge. For example, Melanchthon said: "Scholastic Theology is nothing but vain, false, damned, diabolical jesting and dreams of monks."⁹ But *contemporary Protestants* and *Rationalists*, having a better understanding of the historical and scientific value of scholastic Theology, reject expressly and sharply the insulting language of their predecessors.

Jansenists despise scholastic Theology as being infected with a rational Philosophy; they think that only positive Theology, whether biblical or patristic, should be cultivated, and they exaggerate the authority of St. Augustine: D 2390.

860. Philosophers, who were more or less followers of Francis Bacon of Berulamio, hold that only the experimental method should be used in the sciences, and therefore they attack the speculative method of scholastic Theology. But the *Cartesians* reproach scholastic Theology because it tries to reconcile reason with faith, and therefore it supposes that reason can be limited. Kant, who defended the absolute primacy of pure reason, was of the same mind.¹⁰ The *Semi-Rationalists* and *Modernists*, affirming the absolute independence of the orders of supernatural revelation and natural reason, inveigh bitterly against the scholastic method, because it mingled together these two orders and tried to coordinate them.

861. Doctrine of the Church. 1) The Church has defended *scholastic Theology* and its advocates against its attackers. *Against* Abbot Joachim at *Lateran Council IV* (1215) D 803-804. *Against* Wycliffe and Hus at the *Council of Constance* (1418) D 1179.

Against Protestants, Sixtus V (1588) wrote: Heretics who "in this lamentable century vehemently attack the sacred Theology, which is called Scholastic, we strongly remind that with all our strength we defend, we honor, we promote this same Theology, than which nothing is more fruitful for the Church... Therefore the more they try to attack and destroy this fortified citadel of scholastic Theology, the more it pleases Us to defend this invincible fortress of faith and to preserve and defend the inheritance from Our Fathers, and to decorate as much as we can the passionate defenders of the truth

9. See Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 750; Felder, *Demonstr. Catholica* 339.

10. When they lived: Bacon of Berulamio, 1561-1626; Descartes, 1596-1650; Kant, 1724-1804.

with deserving honors.”¹¹

Against the Synod of Pistoia, Pius VI (*Auctorem fidei*” 1794) D 2676, 2679. *Against Bonnetty*, a traditionalist, Pius IX (1855) D 2814. *Against Günther*, a semi-rationalist, Pius IX (1857) D 2830. *Against the Modernists* Pius X (“*Pascendi*” 1907) D 2104 [34th ed.]. Moreover, in the same Encyclical he says:

“For scholastic philosophy and theology they have only contempt [Modernists]... certain it is that the passion for novelty is always united in them with hatred of scholasticism, and there is no surer sign that a man is on the way to Modernism than when he begins to show his dislike for this system.”¹²

2) The Church has great regard for the *consensus of Theologians*, and she used it as a criterion of theological truth in the *Council of Vienne* (1312) D 901, see D 904. Pius IX expressly stated (1863 “*Tuas libenter*”) that the consensus of Theologians must be followed: D 2876, 2879, 2880, 2913. From the history of the *Councils of Trent* and *Vatican I* it is certain that in them was recognized, as a certain criterion of the truth of faith and morals, *the unanimous consent of the Theologians or of the theological Schools*.¹³

862. Theological note. From the clear commendation of Pius IX, the doctrine of the thesis must be said to be *Catholic doctrine*. From the practical way of acting in the Ecumenical Councils, and especially in *Trent* and *Vatican I*, the thesis is *theologically certain*.

863. Proof. The consensus of Theologians in matters of faith and morals is so intimately connected with the teaching Church that an error in the consensus of the Theologians necessarily would introduce error in the universal Church. But the universal Church in matters of faith and morals cannot err. Therefore, neither can the consensus of the Theologians, and so such consent is a certain criterion of divine Tradition.

The minor is certain from the theses on the infallibility of the Church.

864. The major. The consensus of Theologians in matters of faith and morals is understood as that by which either *they bear witness to the faith* of the Church or *with a certain judgment* they teach a doctrine as *something in matters of faith or morals that must be held by all*. Consensus of Theologians of this kind is intimately connected with the teaching Church and it is so in many ways:

a) *With a connection of origin*, because the teaching Church, that is, Popes, Bishops, Priests, etc., from the middle of the 8th century, for the most part relied on the magisterium of the Theologians and always learned

11. *Bullarium Romanum*, ed. Taurinen. 8,1009-1010.

12. Pius X, Encycl. “*Pascendi*”: ASS 40 (1907) 636.

13. H. Lennerz, *Das Konzil von Trient und theologische Schulmeinungen*: Schol 4 (1929) 44-51; J. Salaverri, *Autoridad del P. Suarez en el Conc. Vaticano*: EstEcl 22 (1948) 61-82.

from it the things related to faith or morals that were to be proposed to the faithful.

b) *With a connection of moral responsibility*, because from the 12th century to the 16th century the teaching Church instituted *all schools* and teachers of Theology, directed or at least watched over them in such a way that also in all the Universities a Chancellor represented the Supreme Pontiff with the task of overseeing *the orthodoxy of doctrine*.¹⁴

c) *With a connection of moral causality*, because after the *Council of Trent* the teaching Church established Seminaries for Clerics, in which under the direct and full control of the Bishops the professors and students dedicated themselves to the study of theology.

d) *With a connection of instrumental influence*, because the teaching Church always used *Theologians* as consultants and as helpers in order to carry out her doctrinal office, both *in an ordinary way* in the Episcopal and Papal *Curias*, and *in an extraordinary way in Councils*—whether particular or general or ecumenical.

e) *With a connection of at least implicit approval*, because the teaching Church diligently took care to proscribe errors, especially those proposed by Theologians in writings, and so after *the Council of Trent* the Supreme Pontiff instituted the *Congregation of the Index*, which had the principal responsibility in this matter; however, this oversight of books was given completely by Benedict XV to the *Congregation of the Holy Office*.¹⁵

865. It is clear from its frequent exercise that this oversight was constant; this can be proved easily from the cases cited by Denzinger from the middle of the 12th century to the *Council of Trent*: on Abelard, D 721; on Theologians at Paris, D 824; on Gulielmo A Sto. Amore, D 840-842; on Peter John de Olivi, D 900-901; on John de Polliaco, D 921; on Marsilius of Padua, D 941; on Eckhart, D 951; on Nicolas of Autrecourt, D 1028; on Denis Foulechat, D 1087; on John Wycliffe and John Hus, D 1151 and 1201; on Zazinus de Solcia, D 1361; on Peter de Rivo, D 1391; on Peter of Osma, D 1411; on Martin Luther, D 1451. This watchfulness has continued unceasingly up to our times, as is clear concerning the *Semi-Rationalists* Hermes and Frohschammer, D 2738 and 1666-1667 [34th ed.], and concerning the *Modernists* in the Decree "*Lamentabili*," D 3401. Because of this close connection, the conclusion must be drawn that an error in the consensus of Theologians concerning matters of faith or morals must necessarily introduce error into the universal Church. On contemporary errors, see *Humani generis*.

866. *A priori* there is *confirmation of this from the healthy rivalry*, which exists between the Theological schools and which the Supreme Pontiffs

14. F. Pelster, *Universitäten*: LTK 10,405-408; H. Schenkl, *Universitäten*: *Lexikon der Pädagogik* 5,309-311.

15. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonikum* t.2 n.488; De S. Congr. S.Officii.

with good reason desire and praise, because it contributes greatly to the progress of studies: D 3666-3667.¹⁶ Hence there is this argument: Because of the healthy rivalry which exists between the various Theological Schools, they carefully examine the assertions made by others and they do not easily admit them unless they find that they are fully demonstrated, especially if the question has to do with matters of faith or morals. Therefore, it follows that the unanimous consent of Theologians in matters of faith and morals is without doubt a criterion of divine Tradition.

867. Objections.¹⁷ The knowledge of Theologians is only relatively true and always fallible. Therefore it cannot be a certain criterion of divine Tradition.

Proof of the antecedent. The knowledge of Theologians is deduced from the deposit of faith by means of the principles of human systems. But human systems are only relatively true and always fallible. Therefore also the knowledge of Theologians is only relatively true and always fallible.

I distinguish the major. The knowledge of Theologians is deduced from the deposit of faith by means of the principles of human systems that are absolutely true and completely certain, *conceded*; only relatively true and merely probable, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* The human systems are only relatively true and always fallible regarding some conclusions which in every human system are given as only relatively true and merely probable, *conceded*; regarding their absolutely true and completely certain principles, *denied*. For a further explanation of this solution, see what we said in n.736.

2. The knowledge of Theologians is a knowledge of the truths of faith through an analogy with the truths of human systems. But this analogous knowledge cannot be absolutely true and completely certain. Therefore the knowledge of Theologians cannot be said to be absolutely true and completely certain knowledge.

I distinguish the major. The knowledge of Theologians is a knowledge of the truths of the faith through a certain true analogy with the truths of human systems—an analogy founded on revelation itself, *conceded*; through an analogy that is not true and not founded on revelation, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Analogous knowledge of the truths of faith through an analogy that is not true and not founded on revelation cannot be absolutely true and completely certain, *I bypass this point*; through a true analogy and one founded on revelation, *I subdistinguish*: it cannot be proper, adequate and comprehensive knowledge, *conceded*; it cannot be absolutely true and completely certain knowledge, although it is analogous, inadequate and abstract, *denied*. For the explanation of this solution see what we said in n.735.

868. 3. Besides the dogmas defined by the Church, the knowledge of Theologians consists in explanations and subtleties, which do not exceed the limits of probability. Therefore one must hold fast to the definitions of the Church as the criterion, but the

16. Pius XI, Encycl. "Studiorum ducem": AAS 15 (1923) 314; Pius XII, Sermon "Solemnis conventus": AAS 31 (1939) 247; Allocution "Animus Noster": AAS 45 (1953) 684-687; see below n.880-883.

17. See De Groot, q.21 a.1; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1921) 605-611; Cotter, 537.

knowledge of Theologians cannot be considered as absolutely true and completely certain knowledge.

I distinguish the antecedent. Besides the defined dogmas, the knowledge of Theologians consists only in merely probable explanations, *denied*; also, *I subdistinguish*: concerning things not yet fully explored and not necessarily connected with revealed truths, *conceded*; concerning things already fully explored and necessarily connected with revealed truths, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent and deny the consequence.*

4. Theologians have an authority that they attribute to themselves. But since they are men, they are fallible. Therefore their authority cannot be a certain criterion of Tradition.

I distinguish the major. Theologians have an authority that they attribute to themselves as individuals, *I bypass the major*, which they attribute to their consensus, *I subdistinguish*: by proving it from the intimate connection of such consensus with the Magisterium of the Church, *conceded*; by attributing it to their consensus arbitrarily and without proof, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Theologians, as men, are fallible as individuals, *conceded*; when they agree with each other, *I subdistinguish*: if they teach independently from the Magisterium of the Church, *conceded*; if they teach in intimate connection with the Magisterium of the Church, *denied*.

869. 5. Agreeing Theologians have erred concerning the matter of the Sacrament of Orders, concerning the sacramentality of the Episcopate and Minor Orders, and concerning other things of this nature, which they taught in intimate connection with the Magisterium of the Church. Therefore Theologians have erred also when they agree and are teaching in intimate connection with the Magisterium of the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Agreeing Theologians have erred in the broad sense and with a probable or less firm opinion when defending some doctrine, *conceded*; when they truly agree and with a certain and firm judgment they propose a doctrine to be held, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent.* On the opinions of Theologians concerning the doctrines just cited, see the treatise on the Sacraments.

6. More than once the unanimous and firm consensus of Theologians of one age has contradicted the unanimous and firm consensus of theologians of subsequent ages. Therefore necessarily Theologians truly and firmly agreeing with each other have erred.

I distinguish the antecedent. A consent broadly unanimous and less firm or concerning things that are not certain or not necessarily connected with revealed truths, *conceded*; a consensus truly unanimous and absolutely firm of subsequent ages has contradicted a consensus truly unanimous and absolutely firm or concerning things certainly and necessarily connected with revealed truths, *denied*.

870. 7. Among Theologians, besides the dogmas defined by the Church, there is no opinion which other Theologians have not contradicted. Therefore among them, besides the dogmas defined by the Church, there is no unanimous and absolutely firm consensus.

I distinguish the antecedent. Among Theologians there is no opinion which several other Theologians have not contradicted, *denied*; which one or other Theologian has not contradicted, *I subdistinguish*: and this one or other dissent prevents achieving a physi-

cally unanimous consent (which we do not require), *conceded*; it prevents a morally unanimous consent (which we hold is sufficient), *denied*.

8. It is permissible for any Theologian, when he has abandoned an opinion of his predecessors, to defend a new one. Therefore a truly morally unanimous consent can always be lacking.

I distinguish the antecedent. In matters of faith and morals and against the truly morally unanimous and absolutely firm consensus of Theologians, *denied*; in another way, *I subdistinguish*: if the new opinion is supported with really serious arguments, *I bypass this*; otherwise, *denied*.

9. The ancient Theologians preached and wrote several centuries after the time of the Apostles, with whom Christian revelation was closed. But the more testimony recedes from its origin, to that degree it tends to deteriorate. Therefore the testimony of Theologians concerning revealed things cannot be maintained as a certain criterion of Tradition.

I concede the major. I distinguish the minor. The more merely human testimony recedes from its origin, the more it tends to deteriorate, *I bypass this*; dogmatic testimony, *I subdistinguish*: conceived independently from the Magisterium of the Church, *I bypass this*; recounted in intimate connection with perennial and infallible Magisterium of the Church, *denied*. The law of degeneration can be admitted in purely human things; but in matters of the Church, which pertain to her substance and her dogmas, the law of degeneration does not apply, because they enjoy perpetuity under the efficacious assistance of God, which makes such degeneration impossible.

871. Scholium. On the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas.

John of St. Thomas, *De approbatione doctrinae divi Thomae* (Curs. theol. Ed. Vivès, 1 p.288; Berthier, *S. Thomas Aquinas Doctor Communis Ecclesiae* 1 (1914); Kleutgen, *Theologie der Vorzeit* 4 n.54-60; Grabmann, *Einführung in die Summa* (1928) 135-148; A. D'Ales, *Thomisme*: DAFC 4,1667-1672; De Groot, *Summa apology*. Q.21 a.2; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.91; Felder, 2,340-345; Müller, *De verbo revelato* 171-176; Schultes, a.73; Dieckmann, n.882-891; Michelitsch, § 254; Dorsch, 754-756; Sadoc Szabo, *Die Autorität des hl. Thomas in der Theologie* (1919); D'Herbigny, *La théologie du révéle* (1921) n.259-279; Lercher, n.546; Cotter, 539-541; *Enchir. Cleric.* Index rerum: "Thom. Aquin," 916; DTC 15,618-761; I.M. Ramirez, *De auctoritate doctrinali S. Thomae* (1952); F. Peister, *La autoridad de Sto. Tomás*: EstEcl 27 (1953) 143-166.

872. We are talking about the authority of St. Thomas in *Theology*. Therefore, we are abstracting from all the reasons and testimonies, which are deservedly brought forth to demonstrate the authority of the Angelic Doctor in Philosophy. But in Theology the authority of St. Thomas is altogether singular and greater, in general, than the authority of any other Doctor or Theologian in the Catholic Church.

1) *The theological authority* of St. Thomas, which is called *intrinsic*, is really the greatest. We call *intrinsic* that authority which proceeds from the intrinsic value of the doctrine. Leo XIII pointed this out well with these words:

"Among the Scholastic Doctors, the chief and master of all towers Thomas Aquinas

nas... Again, clearly distinguishing, as is fitting, reason from faith, while happily associating the one with the other, he both preserved the rights and had regard for the dignity of each; so much so, indeed, that reason, born on the wings of Thomas to its human height, can scarcely rise higher, while faith could scarcely expect more or stronger aids from reason than those which she has already obtained through Thomas."¹⁸

873. 2) The theological authority of the *Angelic Doctor*, which is called *extrinsic*, is also the greatest. We call the authority *extrinsic* which comes to him from the common recognition from the cultivators of the same science of Theology. Leo XIII mentions this:

"Most learned men, in former ages especially, of the highest repute in theology and philosophy, after mastering with infinite pains the immortal works of Thomas, gave themselves up not so much to be instructed in his angelic wisdom as to be nourished upon it. It is known that nearly all the founders and lawgivers of the religious orders commanded their members to study and religiously adhere to the teachings of St. Thomas... And, here, how pleasantly one's thoughts fly back to those celebrated schools and universities which flourished of old in Europe—to Paris, Salamanca, Alcalá, to Douay, Toulouse and Louvain, to Padua and Bologna, to Naples and Coimbra, and to many others! All know how the fame of these seats of learning grew with their years, and that their judgment, often asked in matters of great moment, held great weight everywhere. And we know now in those great homes of human wisdom, as in his own kingdom, Thomas reigned supreme; and that the minds of all, teachers as well as of taught, rested in wonderful harmony under the shield and authority of the Angelic Doctor."¹⁹

874. 3) Finally, the authority of St. Thomas, which can be called *canonical*, is also greater than the authority of any other Catholic Theologian. We are saying that the authority can be called *canonical*, which belongs to the *Angelic Doctor* because of the explicit approval with which the Supreme Pontiffs often have commended his teaching above that of others.

1) *Before Vatican Council I*, a) *in general*, several Supreme Pontiffs have extolled the doctrine of St. Thomas with their praises; Leo XIII in his Encyclical "*Aeterni Patris*" names the main ones.²⁰ b) *In particular*, worthy of mention is the approbation of John XXII in the Consistory before the Canonization (in 1318) and in the *Bull of Canonization itself* of St. Thomas (in 1323).²¹ c) The *special* approbation must be said to be even greater with

18. Leo XIII, Encycl. "*Aeterni Patris*": *Acta Leonis XIII* ed. Desclée 1 (1879) 100f.; EC 416f. On the role that Jos. Kleutgen, S.J., played in writing this Encyclical, see M. Grabmann, *Geschichte der katho. Theologie* p.229, and F. Lakner, *Kleutgen und die kirchliche Wissenschaft*: *ZkathTh* 57 (1933) 161-214. These praises by Leo XIII were repeated by Pius XII in the *Allocution "Animus Noster"*: AAS 45 (1953) 685.

19. Leo XIII, *loc.cit.*, 101: EC 418. See J. Maritain, *El Doctor Angelico* (1942) p.157-161.

20. *Acta Leonis XIII* ed. Desclée 1 (1879) 102: EC 419.

21. John XXII, *Bulla canonizationis "Redemptionem"*: *Bullarium Romanum*, ed. Taurinen. 4 (1323) 303; *Sermo* in Consistorio, in Guil. De Thoco, *Vita S.Thomae* c.13 n.81; Bollandus, *Acta Sanctorum* 7 (7 mart.) 680: EC 1174. See Lercher, n.546.

which Pius V declared St. Thomas to be the Doctor of the universal Church.²²

875. 2) *After Vatican Council I* the Angelic Doctor received singular and very special approval. a) *First of all, from Leo XIII in his Encyclical "Aeterni Patris,"* in which is taught:

"Among the Scholastic Doctors, the chief and master of all towers Thomas Aquinas, who, because he venerated the ancient doctors of the Church most highly, in a certain way seems to have inherited the intellect of all. The doctrines of those illustrious men, like the scattered members of a body, Thomas collected together and cemented, distributed in wonderful order, and so increased with important additions that he is rightly and deservedly esteemed the special bulwark and glory of the Catholic faith... he won this distinction for himself: that, single-handed, he victoriously combatted the errors of former times, and supplied invincible arms to put those to rout which might in after-times spring up."²³

876. b) *Then* there is the *Motu proprio* by Pius X, "*Doctoris Angelici*," for Italy and the adjacent islands, in which he prescribes that the *Summa* of Aquinas be used as a textbook:

"We desire, we command, we prescribe, that those who study sacred Theology in the Universities, Colleges, Seminaries and Institutes, who have from an apostolic indult the power of conferring academic degrees in this discipline, have the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas as the *text* of their lectures and that they explain it in the Latin language: and in this work they should see to it that the students are well disposed towards it." Later the *Congregation for Seminaries and Universities*, under Benedict XV, prescribed the same things for the Bishops of Italy and Germany; and Pius XI, in the Encyclical "*Studiorum ducem*," confirmed the same decree with no reservations.²⁴

c) *Afterwards* by Benedict XV, especially since in the *Code of Canon Law* he prescribed with a universal law of the Church:

"Professors should carefully direct the study of rational Philosophy and Theology and the formation of the students in these disciplines according to the thinking, doctrine and principles of the Angelic Doctor, and hold on to them in a holy manner" (cn. 1366 § 2 [1917]).

877. d) *Also* by Pius XI, when in his Encyclical "*Studiorum ducem*" he confirmed the *Encyclical Letters "Aeterni Patris"* of Leo XIII and the

22. Pius V, *Bulla "Mirabilis Deus"*: *Bullar. Rom.* ed. Taurinen 7 (1567) 564. Among those who prepared the first drafts for the future Vatican Council I, some desired that the Council should recommend St. Thomas; but the majority thought this was not necessary: Msi 49,690f. See Msi 51,281.

23. Leo XIII, Encycl. "*Aeterni Patris*": *Acta Leonis XIII* ed. Desclée 1 (1879) 100f.: EC 416f.

24. Pius X, *Motu proprio "Doctoris Angelici"*: AAS 6 (1914) 340; *S.Cong. de Sem. Et Stud. Univ. ad Episc. Italiae* (920) et *Germaniae* (1921): EC 1107 and 1134; Pius XI, Encycl. "*Studiorum ducem*": AAS 15 (1923) 323. Before that Leo XIII had not actually prescribed, but did recommend to the Bishops of France the *Summa Theologiae* as a textbook: Encycl. "*Depuis le jour*": *Acta Leonis* ed. Desclée 7 (1899) 293; EC 603.

Decree "Doctoris Angelici" of Pius X: D 3665, and when in the same Encyclical he added further:

"We so heartily approve the magnificent tribute of praise bestowed upon this most divine genius that We consider that Thomas should be called not only the *Angelic*, but also the *common* or Universal Doctor of the Church; for the Church has adopted his philosophy for her own, as innumerable documents of every kind attest." The same Pontiff, in the Apostolic Constitution *Deus scientiarum Dominus* a.29a, prescribed: "Sacred Theology is to be handed on by both the positive and the scholastic method; therefore, after having explained the truths of the faith and demonstrated them from Sacred Scripture and Tradition, the nature of these truths and their intimate reasons are to be investigated and illustrated according to the principles and doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas."²⁵

878. c) Finally, by Pius XII, who in his *Sermon "Sollemnis conventus"* decreed:

"It is the wisdom of Aquinas... which is most adapted to explaining and defending the dogmas of the faith; it is what can efficiently oppose and invincibly overcome the principal errors of any age. Therefore present a mind full of love and zeal for St. Thomas: with your whole strength strive to grasp with your intellect his excellent doctrine: willingly embrace whatever manifestly pertains to it and with good reason is found to be most important." And in the *Encyclical "Humani generis"* he says: the Church knows that "his doctrine is in harmony with divine revelation, and is most effective both for safeguarding the foundation of the faith, and for reaping, safely and usefully, the fruits of sound progress."²⁶

879. 4) Therefore, *on the authority* of St. Thomas according to what was just said, these conclusions can be admitted, which R. Schultes defends:

a) "A doctrine, because it is held by St. Thomas, *is not to be held by faith*, neither materially nor formally"; b) "The doctrine of St. Thomas does not have such authority that it must be held as *theologically certain*"; c) "The doctrine of St. Thomas in matters of faith and morals can and must be held *safely (tuto)*, with simple assent, while also respecting the opposite opinion of another School or Doctor."

"Whatever manifestly pertains to it and with good reason is found to be important," *safely can and must be held* (Pius XII), unless "with the

25. Pius XI, Encycl. "*Studiorum duces*": AAS 15 (1923) 314; EC 1174; *Constit. Apost. "Deus scientiarum"*: AAS 23 (1931) 253. *S. Cong. de Sem. Et Stud. Univ. in Ordinationibus* a.18 § 1 prescribes that a.29 *Constit. "Deus scientiarum"* "be piously preserved according to the norm" of the *Encyclical Letters* of Leo XIII "*Aeterni Patris*" and of Pius XI "*Studiorum duces*": AAS 23 (1931) 685.

26. Pius XII, *Sermo "Sollemnis conventus"*: AAS 31 (1939) 246; "*Hum. gen.*": AAS 42 (1950) 73, and in the *Allocution "Animus Noster"*: AAS 45 (1951) 685.

development of a later age it is found to be less coherent" (Leo XIII).²⁷

880. 5) De Groot defined *the nature of the authority* we are considering here, and he says: "The Roman Pontiffs have recommended the body of the Thomistic doctrine above other doctrines as a *safe way and direction* to take in order to obtain the truth."²⁸ And therefore rightly can that norm be applied to the theological doctrines of the Angelic Doctor, which concerning the approval of the philosophical theses of the same author was published by the Congregation for Seminaries and Universities and was confirmed by Benedict XV: "They are proposed as *safe directive norms*." Then this norm was explained further by the same Pontiff in a letter to Rev. Fr. W. Ledóchowski with these words: "We think that you have the right idea, since you think that they adhere sufficiently to the Angelic Doctor who think that all the theses from the doctrine of Thomas should be proposed, and *to be given as safe norms*, but without imposing the requirement that every thesis must be embraced."²⁹

881. 6) *Just freedom and honorable rivalry are to be desired and recommended.* For, fully informed about what was discussed and defined in *Vatican Council I*, Leo XIII wrote his *Encyclical "Aeterni Patris"* in order to offer an effective remedy against the dangers of *Rationalism*. Pius X and Benedict XV published their warnings against *the agnosticism of Modernism*. But these admonitions, which the Pontiffs very wisely prescribed or recommended against *the enemies of the faith*, some Catholics, having given in to a party spirit, distorted into an altercation between *the domestic members of the faith*; so they said that *Thomism* as a system is so prescribed by the Church that even the other *systems of Catholics* must be thought by that very fact to be excluded and at least implicitly disapproved. With this exaggerated interpretation undeservedly and falsely *the honorable rivalry of the Schools, the just freedom of investigation, and the excellent*

27. R. Schultes, O.P., *De Ecclesia* a.73; Pius XII, *Sermon "Sollemnis conventus"*: AAS 31 (1939) 246; Leo XIII, *Encycl. "Aeterni Patris"*: *Acta Leonis XIII* ed. Desclée 1 (1879) 107. Of course those things cannot be held which are contrary to things which later either have been defined by the Magisterium of the Church or are held as certain by the common consent of Theologians, or must be held as doctrines now confirmed by the progress of the sciences. Several propositions of this kind, which were already debated in their own time, are collected together by John of St. Thomas, *Tractatus de approbatione et auctoritate doctrinae D. Thomae* d.2, on the erroneous propositions which are found in St. Thomas: *Cursus theologicus* ed. Vivès 1,336-382.

28. De Groot, O.P., *Summa apolog. de Ecclesia* q.21 a.2 p.815. What it really means to approve a doctrine as "safe" was explained in thesis 15.

29. Confirmation by Benedict XV of the decree of the Congregation for Seminaries and Universities: AAS 8 (1916) 157. The approbation by the same Pontiff of the norms of W. Ledóchowski on embracing the doctrine of St. Thomas: EC 929. See Dieckmann, n.887-890; F. Cavallera, *Autour de S.Thomas*: BullLitEcccl (1917) 115-134. On the significance of the approval of Benedict XV, see F. Pelster, *La autoridad de Sto. Tomás*: EstEcl 27 (1953) 156-159.

progress of knowledge which they produce were hindered—contrary to the mind of Leo XIII himself, who in the *Encyclical "Aeterni Patris"* said expressly:

"We hold that every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsoever discovered or planned, ought to be received with a willing a grateful mind." And after exhorting all to seek "the golden wisdom of St. Thomas," he goes on to say: "The wisdom of St. Thomas, We say; for it anything is taken up with too much subtlety by the scholastic doctors, or too carelessly stated—if there be anything that ill agrees with the discoveries of a later age, or, in a word, improbable in any way—it does not enter Our mind to propose that for imitation to Our age."³⁰

882. Wherefore rightly Pius XI finally solved this domestic quarrel among Catholics according to the centuries-long tradition of the Church, namely, in favor of a *just freedom and honorable rivalry*, by declaring at length:

"Among lovers of St. Thomas, such as all the sons of the Church who are concerned with the highest studies should be, We desire that there exist that honorable rivalry with just freedom from which studies make progress, but no detraction that is not favorable to truth and that serves only to break the bonds of charity. Therefore, let whatever is prescribed in the *Code of Canon Law* (cn. 1366 § 2 [1917]) be sacred to each one of them... and all are to hold themselves to this norm in such a way that they can truly call him their teacher. But let no one exact more from others than what the Church, the teacher and mother of all, demands of all; for in those matters about which there tend to be opposing opinions argued among authors of higher distinction in our Catholic schools, no one is to be prevented from following the opinion that seems to him the more probable": D 3666-3667.

Finally, Pius XII defended the same *freedom and rivalry*, saying:

"We make the warning of Our Predecessors Our own, with which they wished to defend *progress* in true science and *freedom* in studies. We totally approve and recommend that the ancient wisdom, where it is necessary, be reconciled with the new discoveries of the sciences; that those things about which distinguished interpreters of the *Angelic Doctor* are wont to dispute be carried on *freely*; but that new helps derived from history be used in order to gain a fuller understanding of the texts of Aquinas. No private person 'should conduct himself in Church as the master'; and 'no one should demand

30. Leo XIII, *Encycl. "Aeterni Patris"*: *Acta Leonis XIII* ed. Desclée 1 (1879) 107: EC 429. Benedict XV, *Encycl. "Ad Beatissimi"*: AAS 6 (1914) 576-577, openly complained about these altercations between Catholic authors and also defended the just freedom, when he said: "As regards matters in which without harm to faith or discipline—in the absence of any authoritative intervention of the Apostolic See—there is room for divergent opinions, it is clearly the right of everyone to express and defend his own opinion."

That from the positive recommendation of St. Thomas the exclusion of other Doctors cannot be deduced is clear from the fact that St. Bonaventure has also been commended several times by the Supreme Pontiffs: St. Bonaventure, *Opera theologica selecta*, Quaracchi 1 (1934) p.XV-XXV. See Y. Congar: DTC 15,394-396.

more from others than what the Church, the mother and teacher of all, demands from all'; and finally, vain disagreements should not be fostered... For, *rivalry* in the search for truth and advocacy through the commendation of the doctrine of St. Thomas is not to be suppressed, but rather *stirred up* and *safely directed*."³¹

The same Pius XII, in a solemn *Allocution* at the Gregorian University, said that the law, by which the CIC in can. 1366 § 2 [1917] declares that St. Thomas is the chief and teacher in all Catholic schools, must be understood in the sense explained by Pius XI with the words quoted by us in this number. Furthermore, Pius XII, while again commending a just *freedom*, added:

"But in what pertains to your studies, Catholic doctrine and the natural truths related to it, which are acknowledged by all Catholics, should not be mixed in a confused manner with the attempts of learned men to explain them, and likewise with the proper elements and the special reasons with which the various philosophical and theological systems, which are found in the Church, are distinguished from each other... No discipline or reason of this kind is the door by which someone enters into the Church; and even with more reason it is wrong to say that this is the only door that is open... Your outstanding authors and teachers with wonderful agreement share in the common fidelity, which they preserve with the supreme Doctor, with the *highly valued freedom*, which is due to the thorough study of doctrines, by Our predecessors, namely Leo XIII and to those who followed him in the Chair of Peter, which is always a place of safety. Therefore, let there be full freedom for each one of the Professors, within the assigned limits that should not be exceeded, to adhere to any school, which rightly has a home in the Church, but with this rule, that the truths that must be maintained by all are distinguished from the outlines and elements of a particular school, and in their teaching let them note this distinction so that it is very befitting the teacher... the true and genuine doctrine of the Church should not be mixed in with the various and special opinions of any school; indeed, these two must always be carefully distinguished from each other."³²

883. 7) Therefore the teaching of St. Thomas has been approved by the Church *in a very special way* and so it enjoys a special authority *as a safe way* to attain the truth. However, a) it does not follow that each one of his propositions must be thought *to be sanctioned as true* by the Church; b) and so the assertions of other Theologians, who are praised in the Church, although their assertions are contrary to those of Aquinas, cannot be said to be rejected by the Church *as false* or *erroneous* in any way; c) nor does it follow that *the other systems of Theologians*, besides the Thomistic, must be designated as *not safe ways* (*viae non tutae*) to attain the truth; d) in fact,

31. Pius XII, *Sermon "Sollemnis conventus"*: ASS 31 (1939) 247, who also cites the words, with which the same freedom was defended by Benedict XV, *Encycl. "Ad Beatissimi,"* and Pius XI, *Encycl. "Studiorum ducem"*: AAS 6 (1914) 576 and AAS 15 (1923) 3234; D 3667. See M. Labourdette, O.P.: RevThom 50 (1950) 43-44.

32. Pius XII, *Allocution "Animus Noster,"* delivered on October 17, 1953, to the Moderators, Professors, and Alumni, who gathered to celebrate the completion of the fourth century of the foundation of the Pontifical Gregorian University: AAS 45 (1953) 684-687.

the just freedom of science and the honorable rivalry of the sciences, which the Church positively desires and recommends, implies at least an implicit recommendation that within the norms, which the Church, as the teacher and mother of all prescribes for all, the various systems of Catholics *freely* and also *emulously* be cultivated and fostered, in order to obtain the very best fruits of scientific progress.

EPILOGUE

ON THE VALUE AND CENSURE OF PROPOSITIONS IN THEOLOGY

884. On the theological value of propositions

Io. De Torquemada, *Summa de Ecclesia* 1.4 p.2 c.8-12; M. Cano, *De locis* 1.12 c.6-10; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.19 s.2 n.1-24; B. Beraza, *De virtutibus* n.873-886; Montagnus, *De censuris seu notis theologicis et de sensu propositionum* in Migne, *Cursus theologicus*, 1,1111-1222; H. Quillet, *Censures doctrinales*: DTC 2,2101-2113; Franzelin, *De Tradition eth.* 12 schol.2; Bainvel, *De Magisterio* n.105. In treatises *On the Church*: Wilmers, n.247; De Groot, q.10 a.5f.; Billot, q.10 th.17 § 2; Muncunill, n.520-530; Michelitsch, § 244; D'Herbigny, n.390f.; Schultes, a.70; Dieckmann, n.892-896; De Guibert, n.352. See J. Salaverri, *De valore et censura propositionum* in *Theologia*: EstEcl 23 (1949) 170-188; S. Cartechini, *De valore notarum theologicarum* (1951); A. Lang, *Der Bedeutungswandel der Begriffe "fides" und "haeresis"*: MünchThZt 4 (1953) 133-146.

885. Note. Presupposing the theses which we have proved in the treatise on the Ecclesiastical Magisterium, we now intend to deal briefly with the *Notes of value and censure* of propositions in Theology, which *necessarily and immediately* are deduced from the proven theses. We have decided to explain only the *principal Notes*, namely, those which we draw from the relation of the propositions to the *Universal Magisterium of the Church* and to the *Sources themselves* of divine revelation.

Theological *censures* already in the Middle Ages were used by John XXII against the errors of the Fraticelli, Marsilius of Padua and others; they were also used by the *Council of Constance* against Wycliffe and Hus; after that the use of censures in the Church happened frequently.¹

886. Definition of terms. The *value* of propositions in Theology is a judgment *positively* expressing the grade of certitude that belongs to them based on their agreement with the truth, which the Sources of revelation and the universal Magisterium of the Church show.

The *censure* of propositions in Theology is a judgment *negatively* expressing the grade of falsity that belongs to them based on their distance from the truth, which the Sources of revelation and the universal

1. For the principal *Censures* used before *Vatican I*, consult D 916, 923-924, 930, 946, 979, 1087, 1251, 1416, 1491, 1980, 2005, 2268, 2291, 2331, 2373, 2501, 26012693. See J. Koch, *Philosophische und theologische Irrtumslisten von 1270-1329. Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung der theologischen Zensuren*: Bibliothèque Thomiste XIV, Melanges Mandonnet 2 (1930) 305-329.

Magisterium show.²

The *denominations*, by which the value or censure of propositions are expressed, are various. They are called *Notes*, because they *notify* the theological importance that the propositions have; they are called *Qualifications*, because they manifest the quality of the theological propositions; they are named *Values* or *Censures*, because they indicate the category of *estimation* or *disapproval* that the propositions merit theologically.

Way of proceeding. We will deduce the Notes of the value and censure of propositions in Theology *immediately* from the proved theses concerning the *Sources of revelation*, which contain the written or handed on word of God, and concerning the *universal Magisterium*, “to which God committed the protection and interpretation of his own words.”³

In defining the *Notes* and *Censures* we follow the criterion of a *strict interpretation* which the Church prescribes for us in these words: “*Nothing is understood to be declared or defined dogmatically unless it is manifestly established*”: CIC can. 1323 § 3 [1917].

887. 1. Of divine faith (*de fide divina*) is a proposition which is contained *directly and formally* in the *Sources* of revelation.

For, from thesis 19 we know for certain that truths revealed by God through the Apostles are contained in the *Sources of revelation*, that is, in *Holy Scripture* and in *divine Tradition* (D 1501). But from Vatican I we know “we are bound to yield by faith the full homage of intellect and will to the God who reveals, and we believe that what he has revealed is true... because of the authority of God who reveals it” (D 3008). Hence it follows immediately, because it is fully certain that a proposition is contained directly or formally *in the Sources of Revelation*, that it must be said to be a matter of *divine faith*. Consequently, the contrary must be called *an error in divine faith*.

Now a proposition *in the Sources of revelation* can be contained there directly and formally in two ways, namely, *explicitly* or *implicitly*. *Explicitly* is what is found in the Sources *expressly*; but *implicitly* is what is *immediately* deduced from explicitly revealed truths *alone*. From this we conclude that a proposition can be *of divine faith*

2. A *censure* properly indicates a sign of disapproval: Ovid, *Remedia amoris* v.361-362: “For recently they have carped at our little books, and their *censure* is my bold muse.” See Velleius, *Historia* 1.2 c.36: Gellius, *Noctium Atticarum* 1.2 c.2. Likewise Tertullian, *Adv. Marcionem* 1.1 c.29: “A transgression of this kind is to be reprovved, according to the *censure* of the Institutor”: ML 2,307. See Id., *Apologeticum* c.39: *De carne Christi* c.4: ML 1,532; 2,804.

3. See D 1501, 1507-1508, 3007, 3011, 3020, 3069-3070. Leo XIII, *Encycl. “Sapientiae christianae”*: ASS 22 (1890) 394.

in two ways—one of *divine faith* explicitly, and the other of *divine faith* implicitly. But Theologians rightly speak of both of them simply as being of *divine faith*.

888. 2. A proposition is **theologically certain** (*theologice certa*) which is *deduced* from the *Sources* of revelation, by means of another naturally certain truth, by a proper and strict deduction.

For, from thesis 17 we know that there are propositions which formally and directly *in themselves are not revealed*, and therefore “per se do not belong to the deposit of faith,”⁴ but which are said to be *virtually revealed*, because they are arrived at by a true and proper deduction from formally revealed truths, by means of other naturally certain truths. Truths of this kind, because of this *theological and certain connection of them* with revealed truths, are called *theologically certain*. Consequently the contrary propositions are called *theological errors*.

889. 3. A proposition *in general* is **of faith** (*de fide*) which *pertains to the faith*, either directly or formally, either indirectly or virtually.

For, the propositions described under numbers 1 and 2 above *agree* in the fact that *they look to faith*; although *they differ specifically* because some pertain to faith directly or formally, but others only indirectly or virtually; therefore looked at according to this generic reason, in which they agree, they are wont to be called by Theologians also *of faith in general*, according to the teaching of St. Thomas:

“Now a thing may be of faith *in two ways: in one way, directly and principally*, e.g., the articles of faith; in another way, indirectly and secondarily, e.g., those matters, the denial of which leads to the corruption of some article of faith; and there may be *heresy in either way, even as there can be faith*.”⁵

890. Doctrine on faith or morals is a phrase which the Fathers at *Vatican Council I* understood in this *generic* sense:

For, the *Secretary*, Bishop Grasseri, in the name of the *Committee for Faith*, when explaining to the Fathers of the Council the definition of the pontifical infallibility, said: “The present definition enuntiates only generically the object of infallibility, when it

4. Msi 52,1226. See thesis 17, n.700.711.

5. S.Th. II-II, q. 11, a. 2; I, q. 32, a. 4. *Theologians* like M. Cano agree, who says: “Since the *truth* of faith is twofold, and one part *pertains to faith in a mediated way* and the other *immediately*; it is necessary immediately from the beginning to determine two general grades of the propositions of Faith. The *first* grade of them will be the legitimate principles of Theology, that is, everything that *God has revealed in themselves* to the Church. But the *second* grade of them will be *what is necessarily concluded from the first ones*; for, these kinds of conclusions, as *connected with the truths of faith*, also pertain to Faith” (*De locis* 1.12 c.6 beginning). Marín Sola, *Evolución homogénea del Dogma* n.453f.

says, namely, that it is *the doctrine on faith or morals*." But in what follows he explains how "in this object enuntiated so *generically*" are included, first of all "truths pertaining to *the deposit of faith*," and then also those "which although *in themselves are not revealed*, nevertheless are required in order to fully protect, properly explain and efficaciously define the deposit itself of revelation."⁶

Therefore the propositions, which in this way *look to faith generically*, when Theologians do not want to or cannot determine them further, whether they pertain to the deposit of Faith *only virtually and indirectly*, or *also formally and directly*, usually say that they are *of faith in general*. Consequently the contrary propositions are called *errors concerning faith (errores circa fidem)*.

891. 4. Infallibly certain and consequently **of faith in general** is a proposition which is taught by the universal Magisterium of the Church *by an infallible act*, either by a solemn judgment of a Council or of the Pope, or by the universal and ordinary Magisterium.

For, from theses 13 and 14 we know that in the Church there is an *infallible Magisterium*, which by its definitions excludes the very possibility of error. From this it follows immediately that the propositions, which are proposed with an *infallible act* by the Magisterium *by that very fact are infallibly certain*. A contrary proposition rightly can be called *an error in infallibly certain doctrine*.

Now from thesis 16 we know for certain that only "*doctrine on faith or morals*" or *on faith in general* (according to n.3) is defined infallibly by the Magisterium of the Church; hence we conclude immediately that a proposition proposed *infallibly* by the Church must be said to be, consequently, a matter *of faith in general*.⁷ And because it is defined by the *universal* Magisterium, it is called *of Catholic faith in general*.

892. 5. Catholic doctrine in the strict sense is that which the *universal* Magisterium teaches *merely authentically*, that is, by an act of true doctrinal authority, but not excluding the possibility of error.

For, according to thesis 15, there is in the Church a *universal and authentic Magisterium*, to which is owed internal and religious assent, although it does not intend to define something by an infallible act of authority: D 2880, 3045. The doctrine which is taught authentically by the Church with this lesser grade of authority, because it is proposed by the *universal* Magisterium, is usually said to be Catholic Doctrine *in the strict sense*. The contrary can be said to be an *error in Catholic Doctrine*.

6. Msi 52,1225-1227; see Msi 49,627. Read also D 3011, 3017, 3018, 3045. See also from thesis 16, n.692.

7. The *Vatican I* outline II on the Church agrees: "things defined by the Roman Pontiff, speaking *ex cathedra* to be held by all, must be held *as infallibly true*" (Msi 53,326ab).

893. 6. *Catholic doctrine in general* is that which is taught by the *universal* Magisterium, either infallibly or merely authentically.

For, the propositions described under numbers 4 and 5 above agree in the fact that they are taught *authentically* by the *universal* Magisterium, although they differ *specifically* in the fact that some *infallibly* but others *merely authentically* are proposed; therefore and according to this generic reason, in which they agree, they are said by Theologians to be of *Catholic Doctrine in general*, as Báñez already said accurately:

“Catholic faith is one thing and *Catholic doctrine* is something else. For there are some things which are taught *universally* in the Catholic Church, however they are not Catholic faith.”⁸

Therefore the propositions, which thus are proposed *generically* by the *universal* Magisterium of the Church, when Theologians do not desire or cannot determine further whether they are taught *merely authentically* or also *infallibly*, are wont to say that they are *Catholic doctrine in general*. Contrary propositions can be said to be *in general errors concerning Catholic doctrine*.

894. A proposition is of *divine and Catholic faith in general* which is contained *directly* or *formally* in the Sources of revelation and is proposed by the Church *infallibly as something to be believed*: D 3011.

For, from thesis 16 we know that the *direct* and primary object of an *infallible* act of the Magisterium is the truths *directly* and *formally* revealed. Hence a proposition *formally revealed* and *infallibly* proposed by the Magisterium involves a twofold respect—one to the Sources of revelation, because of which it is said to be of *divine faith* (according to n.1), the other to the *universal* Magisterium, because of which it is said to be of *Catholic faith* (according to n.4). Wherefore a proposition of this kind is named of *divine and Catholic faith* by a decree of *Vatican Council I*:

“All those things are to be believed *with divine and Catholic faith* that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed”: D 3011.⁹

895. A doctrine of this kind, as *divinely revealed*, is imposed by the Church as *something to be believed*; and therefore it is called a *Dogma*

8. D. Báñez, *In 2.2* q.11, a. 2. Similarly Suarez who said: “Catholic doctrine is the same thing as universal doctrine” (*De fide* d.3 s.10 n.3).

9. For an explanation of this decree of Vatican I based on the Acts of the Council, see thesis 13, n.551f. The same statement is presented in CIC 1323 § 1f. [1917].

of *divine faith*, as Pius IX suitably taught in his Letter "*Tuas libenter*": D 2879-2880. The contrary doctrine deservedly is called *formally heretical*, according to the clear edict of the Church:

She says that a baptized person who obstinately "denies or has doubts about one of the truths, *which must be believed with divine and Catholic faith, is a heretic*": CIC 1325 § 2 [1917].

Now from theses 13 and 14 and from the just quoted Vatican decree, we are certain that the Magisterium of the Church can propose a doctrine *infallibly* in two ways: a) *in an extraordinary way*, that is, *by a solemn judgment* either of an Ecumenical Council or of the Supreme Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra*, and b) *in the ordinary way*, that is, by an act of the *ordinary and universal* Magisterium dispersed throughout the world: D 3011, 2879. From this twofold way of exercising infallibility two other *Notes* are immediately deduced, which follow, as *two varieties* included under the *Note of divine and Catholic faith in general*, which are distinguished from each other only *accidentally*, because the *ways* of exercising infallibility, specifying them, differ among themselves only *accidentally*.

896. 8. Of divine Catholic faith is a doctrine *formally* revealed which is proposed by the Church *infallibly as something to be believed by a solemn judgment* of an Ecumenical Council or of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*.

For, from theses 13 and 14 we know that a *definition* in the strict sense is *infallible by a solemn judgment*. Hence a *formally revealed* doctrine proposed in this way, is said to be *of divine faith*, because it is *formally* revealed (according to n.1), and it is also said to be *of defined faith*, because the Church proposes it *with a solemn judgment to be believed*, by a *definition*, either of a Council or of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, for

"To pronounce a solemn judgment of this kind is proper both to an Ecumenical Council and to the Pope when he speaks *ex Cathedra*": CIC 1323 § 2 [1917].¹⁰

Rightly, therefore, a proposition, which is proposed *by a solemn judgment to be believed*, was wont to be called *of defined divine faith*, and it is a *solemnly defined Dogma of divine faith*. The contrary doctrine consequently can be said to be *formally and solemnly heretical*.

On the intention of solemnly defining of the *Councils of Trent* and *Vatican I* both in the *chapters* of the decrees and in the *canons*, see what we say below: *Scholium*, n.906-908.

897. 9. Of divine and Catholic faith *strictly* is a *formally revealed* proposition which is proposed by the Church *infallibly to be believed by*

10. *Notes of the Committee for the Faith* on the first draft of the Constitution "*De Fide Catholica*": Msi 52,25. For the draft of *Constitution II "De Ecclesia Christi"*: Msi 53,259.

the ordinary and *universal* Magisterium.

For, from theses 13 and 16 we know that a doctrine *formally revealed* is proposed *infallibly* by the Church to be believed, not only by a solemn judgment, but also *by the universal and ordinary Magisterium* dispersed throughout the world. A doctrine of this kind proposed *infallibly* by the Church in this way is said to be *of divine faith*, because it is *formally revealed* (according to n.1), and it is said to be *of Catholic faith*, because the Church proposes it *infallibly by the universal and ordinary Magisterium* as something to be believed (according to n.4).

Rightly, therefore, a proposition which the *universal and ordinary Magisterium* proposes as something to be believed is called *of divine and Catholic faith strictly*, and it is a *Dogma of divine and Catholic faith*. The contrary doctrine deservedly can be said to be *formally heretical*.

On the intention of the Bishops of proposing a doctrine *peremptorily* as a doctrine *to be believed*, it is necessary to establish it from the way in which they impose it, that is, if "they use the formulas whereby it is evident that they want to obligate all to embrace this doctrine *with the assent of divine faith*."¹¹ Because the *universal Magisterium* imposes the doctrine with such an obligation *to believe it*, therefore it is said to be a *Dogma of divine and Catholic faith*: D 2879.

898. 10. Of Catholic faith in general is a doctrine which is certainly and necessarily *connected* with revealed truths and it is proposed *infallibly* by the Church *as something to be believed*.¹²

For, from thesis 17 we know that the *indirect* object of the infallible act of the Magisterium is truths certainly and necessarily *connected with revealed truths*. Truths of this kind are really proposed by the infallible Magisterium *not as things to be believed*, because, since *they do not pertain directly and formally* to the deposit of faith, it is not fully certain that they can be *believed with divine faith* "because of the authority of God himself who reveals them" D 3008; however, they are proposed as something *to be held*, because, on account of their certain and necessary *connection with revealed truths*, the believer must embrace them with the *absolutely certain* assent of the mind, in order properly to guard the deposit of the Faith.

A doctrine of this kind, because on the one hand, because of its necessary connection with revealed truths, *it pertains to faith only virtually*, it is rightly said to be *of faith in general* (according to n.3); but because on the other hand by the Church it is *proposed infallibly to be held*, rightly it is said to be *Catholic doctrine in general* (according to n.6). Wherefore by

11. Acta Vaticani: Msi 49,670. See thesis 13, scholium 3, n.583.

12. J.V. Bainvel, *De Magisterio vivo et Traditione* n.52.

including this twofold respect under one name, we can call such a doctrine *of Catholic faith in general*. Therefore we can call the contrary doctrine *an error concerning Catholic faith in general*.

899. In this Note and in the two that follow we are making this supposition: namely, that the doctrine necessarily and *merely connected with revealed truths* is proposed infallibly by the Church, not *as something to be believed with divine faith*, but only *to be held with absolute certitude*. Certainly this supposition underlies the *Decrees of Vatican Council I*, as we will show briefly below in *Scholium 2* n.909-912.

Those who admit the so-called *ecclesiastical faith*, which is the assent of the mind because of the authority of the *Church herself* teaching infallibly, call this Note "*ecclesiastical faith in general*." And they call the censure of the contrary doctrine *an error in ecclesiastical faith in general*.¹³

Now from theses 13 and 14 we know that the Magisterium of the Church proposes doctrine *infallibly in two ways only accidentally different*, namely, a) *in an extraordinary way*, that is, *by a solemn judgment* either of an Ecumenical Council or of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, or b) *in the ordinary way*, that is, by an act of the ordinary and universal Magisterium dispersed throughout the world. From this twofold way of proposing doctrine infallibly, *two other Notes* are deduced, *distinct from each other only accidentally* and included under the *Note of Catholic faith in general*—one of divine

13. Those holding **Ecclesiastical Faith** are: H. Kilber, in *Wirceburgenses* (1880) t.1 n.118 and t.8 n.71-73; Vacant, *Études théologiques sur les Constitutions du Conc. Du Vatican 2* (1895) p.88; M.J. Scheeben, *Dogmatik* (1927) t.1 n.706; G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* (1897) n.260-262; Id., *De Fide* (1902) n.54-59, 241-253, 264-270; Ch. Pesch, *Praelec.* T.8 (1922) n.265; Id., *Compend.* T.3 n.376; L. Billot, *De Virtutibus* (1905) n.103; L. Choupin, *Valeur des décisions du S.Siège* (1928) p.44-49; Tanquerey, *De Ecclesia* n.837; Id., *De Fide* n.192; De Groot, *Summa de Ecclesia* (1906) p.386; G. van Noort, *De Fontibus revelat.* (1911) n.246-250; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* (1912) n.963-969; F. Diekamp, *Kathol. Dogmatik* (1923) t.1 § 6; H. Felder, *Apologet.* (1923)t.2 p.270; G. Huarte, *De Gratia et Virtut.* (1923) th.8 n.123; R. Schultes, *Introd. In Hist. Dogmat.* (1922) 13; Id., *De Ecclesia* (1925) 614-636; A. Michelitsch, *Apologet.* (1925) § 242; Io. Hermann, *Instit. Theol.* (1926) t.2 n.1330; A.M. Elorriaga: *EstEcl* 5 (1926) 113-137, 225-243; Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* (1928) 419-421; H. Lennerz, *De Virtut. theol.* (1938) n.181f.; L. Koesters, *Die Kirche* (1938) 224; L. Lercher-Mitzka, *Instit. theol.* (1945) t.1 n.616. To these are added: J.B. Franzelin, *De Traditione* (1896) th.12 schol.1 princ.2 corol.2; princ.4 corol. 4; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif. Prolegom. de Ecclesia* (1902) § 40 n.5; J. Mendive, *Instit. theol.* (1895) t.1 351; H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* (1925) n.895; G.M. Paris, *De Ecclesia* (1920)169; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) 250; A. Landgraf, *Glaupe*: LTK 3,520; A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* (1940) 425; A.C. Cotter, *Theol. Fundam.* (1940) 418-518; Ph. Alonso-Bárcena, *De Magisterio* (1945) 105-163; F.X. Calcagno, *Theol. Fundam.* (1948) n.379; R. Favre, *Les condamnations avec anathema*: *BullLittEccl* 47 (1946) 226-241; 48 (1947) 31-48, see 42-45; P. Parente, *Theologia fundam.* (1947) p.180-237; M. Labourdette, O.P.: *RevThom* 50 (1950) 39; De Aldama: *SThS* III, 4, *de fide* (1951) n.156; S. Cartechini, *De valore notarum theologiarum* (1951) p.41-51.

Those who reject **Ecclesiastical Faith** are especially: S. Schiffini, *De Virtutibus* (1904) n.124-130; C. Mazzella, *De Virtutibus* (1902) 411-414; M. Tuyaerts, *L'Evolution du Dogme* (1919) 121f.; F. Marín-Sola, *La evolución homogénea del Dogma* (1923) c.5 p.249-334; A. Gardeil, *Le donné révélé et la Théologie* (1910) 185f.; Id.L. *RevScPhTh* 13 (19240 582-583; B. Beraza, *De Virtutibus* (1929) 147f.; A. Stolz, *De Ecclesia* (1939) 48-52; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* (19410 416, but see p. 424f.; F.G. Martinez, *A proposito de la llamada "fe eclesiastica"*: *Misc.Com* 6 (1946) 9-45; *RevEspT* 11 (1951) 209-253.

faith, but the other of *Catholic faith strictly*.

900. 11. Of defined faith is a doctrine which certainly and necessarily is *connected with revealed truths* and is proposed by the Church as something *infallibly to be held by a solemn judgment* of an Ecumenical Council or of the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*.

For from the theses 13, 14 and 17 we know for certain that a doctrine revealed only virtually, that is, *necessarily connected with revealed truths*, can be defined by the Church *infallibly by a solemn judgment*. Hence a doctrine connected with revealed truths *so defined* is said to be *of faith*, because it is virtually revealed, that is, *necessarily connected with formally revealed truths* (according to n.3), and it is said further to be *defined*, because the Church had defined it *with a solemn infallible judgment as a truth to be held* (according to n.8).

Rightly, therefore, by joining together these two respects, we can say that a doctrine *connected with revealed truths and defined by a solemn judgment of the Church* must be called *of defined faith*. So the *censure* of the contrary doctrine is said to be *an error in defined faith*.

Those who admit *ecclesiastical faith* call a positive doctrine of this kind a matter of *defined ecclesiastical faith*. And they call its contrary *an error in defined ecclesiastical faith*.

901. 12. Of Catholic faith strictly is a doctrine which is certainly and necessarily *connected with revealed truths* and is proposed *infallibly to be held by the universal and ordinary Magisterium of the Church*.

For from theses 13, 14 and 17 we know that a doctrine necessarily *connected with revealed truths* can be proposed *infallibly to be held by the universal and ordinary Magisterium of the Church*. Hence a doctrine *connected in this way with revealed truths and infallibly proposed* is said to be *of faith*, because it *pertains to faith* as necessarily *connected with formally revealed truths* (according to n.3); furthermore, it is called *Catholic*, because the Church has proposed it as *infallibly to be held by the universal and ordinary Magisterium dispersed throughout the world* (according to n.9). Therefore, by joining together these two respects, we say that a doctrine *connected with revealed truths and proposed infallibly to be held by the universal Magisterium of the Church*, must be said to be a matter of *Catholic faith strictly*. And the contrary doctrine consequently is said to be *an error in Catholic faith*.

The defenders of *ecclesiastical faith* call the same doctrines, respectively, *of Catholic ecclesiastical faith*, and *an error in Catholic ecclesiastical faith*.

902. Note well that we distinguish clearly the *Notes* described under numbers 7, 8

and 9 from the *Notes* in numbers 10, 11 and 12. Specifically, they are different from each other because the *first three* denominate doctrines *contained formally in the deposit of faith*, but the *last three* are dealing with doctrines *merely connected with the deposit of faith*. Therefore we advisedly say that the first ones *are to be believed with divine faith*, but we say that the last ones *are to be held with faith*. However, several Theologians, by abbreviating the names, designate the propositions as being *of defined faith* and *of Catholic faith*. These propositions, according to Vatican I (D 3011), more accurately should be designated as *of defined divine faith* and *of Catholic divine faith* (according to n.7, 8 and 9). This clarification should offer sufficient help in order to interpret correctly the varying terminology of the authors.¹⁴

903. 13. Other propositions are often said to be **proximate to the Notes**, which up to this point we have been considering. Thus, for example, a proposition that is said with an almost unanimous consent of theologians to be *proximate* either *to divine faith*, or *to heresy*, or *to Catholic faith*, or *to theological error*, and so forth, is considered to be either *of divine faith*, or *heretical*, or *of Catholic faith*, or *a theological error*, etc.

904. 14. A proposition is customarily said to be **certain in Theology** which certainly and necessarily is deduced from one premise that is *theologically certain* and from another premise that is *naturally certain*; or one which by a common and constant consent of Theologians is retained as a *certain theological conclusion*. But its contrary is considered to be *temerarious and false*. See D 2880.

14. We are presupposing that the doctrine, which *objectively only is connected* with revealed truths, has not become *objectively formally revealed* through the infallible knowledge and definition of the Church; because the act *of knowledge and declaration* of the known object, in no way changes the *objective formality* itself of the same object, unless it is an act *of the formal revelation or inspiration of God*.

905. Outline of the Value and Censures of Propositions in Theology

Notes	Required Conditions	Censures
1. Of divine Faith	<i>In the Sources of revelation formally or directly contained.</i>	Error in divine Faith.
2. Theologically certain.	<i>Deduced strictly from Sources of revel. by means of naturally certain truth.</i>	Theological error.
3. Of Faith in general	<i>Pertaining to revealed truths either formally and directly, or virtually-indirectly.</i>	Error concerning Faith in general.
4. Infallibly certain doctrine, = of Faith in general.	<i>Taught by the Magisterium of the by an infallible act.</i>	Error in infallible or in Faith.
5. Catholic doctrine strictly.	<i>Taught by the universal Magisterium merely authentically.</i>	Error in Catholic doctrine.
6. Catholic doctrine in general	<i>Taught by the universal Magisterium either infallibly or merely authentically.</i>	Error concerning Catholic doctrine.
7. Of divine and Catholic Faith in general.	<i>Contained formally in Sources of rev., and proposed infallibly to be believed. Dogma of divine Faith.</i>	Heretical formally and in general.
8. Of defined divine Faith.	<i>Contained formally in Sources of rev., and defined by solemn judgment to be believed. Dogma of defined divine Faith.</i>	Heretical formally solemnly.
9. Of divine and Catholic Faith strictly.	<i>Contained formally in Sources of rev. and proposed infallibly by the universal Magisterium to be believed. Dogma of div. and Catholic Faith.</i>	Heretical formally, strictly.
10. Of Catholic Faith in general.	<i>Necessarily connected with revealed truths and proposed infallibly to be believed.</i>	Error in Catholic Faith in general.
11. Of defined Faith	<i>Connected with revealed truths, and defined by a solemn infallible judgment to be believed.</i>	Error in defined Faith.
12. Of Catholic Faith strictly.	<i>Connected with revealed truths and Proposed by the universal infall. Magisterium to be held.</i>	Error in Catholic Faith strictly.
13. Proximate to the described Notes 1-12.	<i>Proximately approaching the described Notes from the almost unanimous consent of Theologians</i>	Proximate to the described Censures 1-12.
14. Certain in Theology.	<i>Strictly deduced from theol. certain premises, by way of naturally certain truth. Or held as such by the unanimous consent of Theologians.</i>	Temerarious and false.

906. Scholium. 1. *The Councils of Trent and Vatican I intended to define also in the Chapters.*

An infallible *solemn judgment* in the Councils of *Trent and Vatican I* is expressed in two ways: a) *in a positive form*, or assertively, in the *Chapters*; b) but *in a negative form*, or in a condemning way, in the *Canons*. This manifest intention of *Trent* is abundantly clear from the express words of the Council itself: D 1520 and 1627; 1635 and 1649-1650; 1667 and 1697-1700; 1738 and 1750; 1763 and 1767-1770.

907. In *Vatican I*, at the request of the Fathers of the Council, the same twofold form of defining was used. For, the *Secretary*, Bishop Simor, in the name of the *Committee for the Faith*, said: "Your request was that in this Vatican Ecumenical Council we should proceed in the same way as the Council of Trent proceeded: namely, that *first of all the doctrine* of the Church be proposed, and then that *Canons* be added in which the errors *opposed to Catholic doctrine* are condemned."¹⁵

This same intention of Vatican I was expressed in the Introductions to the *Constitutions "De Fide Catholica"* and *"De Ecclesia Christi"*: D 3000, 3050-3052. Moreover, it is certain from the Acts of the Council that this was the meaning of the Introductions. For, Rev. Alexander M. Teppa requested that in the Introduction to the *Constitution "De Fide Catholica"* other more explicit words be added, "so that more expressly, he said, the error of those may be refuted (and he names Denzinger), who contend that only those things in the *Chapters* should be held as defined which correspond to the subject in the *Canons*."¹⁶

The *Secretary*, Bishop Gasser, in the name of the *Committee for Faith*, responded to him: "The same point, although not with such explicit words, is already really stated with the words: 'But now, together with the bishops of the whole world who, gathered in the Holy Spirit in this ecumenical council by Our authority, sit and judge with Us, and relying on the *Word of God, written and handed down* as We have received it, reverently preserved and authentically interpreted by the Catholic Church, *We have decided to profess and declare from this chair of Peter, in the sight of all, the saving doctrine of Christ, rejecting and condemning opposing errors* by means of the power granted Us by God': D 3000. 'Therefore in these words it is said that, between the doctrine which is stated in the *Chapters of the Constitution on the Faith* and the doctrine which is given in the *Canons*, there is no difference other than what there is between the *positive* doctrine of faith and the *negative*. The first decrees what *must be held by faith*; but the second what *must be avoided and condemned concerning the faith*.'"¹⁷

15. *Acta Vaticani*: Msi 51,44. The same point, when the occasion was given, was repeated in Vatican I: Msi 51,291f.379; 52,1229d.

16. Msi 51,394. In fact Denzinger in the first nine editions of the *Enchiridion*, which he himself prepared from the year 1854 until 1907, wrote in the Prologue: "The explanations of the *Canons*, v.gr. the *Chapters of Trent*, parentheses, the added reasons, for the most part do not fall under definition, nevertheless they are of the greatest authority." C. Bannwart in the tenth edition of the *Enchiridion* commented on these words: "It is sufficiently apparent that this example by a distinguished author was less suitably chosen from the words themselves of *Trent*." Therefore in the more recent editions that former assertion has rightly been omitted.

17. *Acta Vaticani*: Msi 51,415; 52,1229.

908. *Theologians* now unanimously hold that solemn definitions are contained no less in the *Chapters* than in the *Canons* of the Councils of *Trent* and *Vatican I*.¹⁸ However, they do recognize some difference existing between the *Chapters* and the *Canons*. For it is certain that “the Church in the *Canons* does not adduce reasons, but simply *condemns errors* with definite words. Reasons pertain to *Doctrine*; a condemnation expressed with words pertains to the *Canons*.¹⁹ Wherefore in the *Chapters*, besides what the Church defines *assertively, directly and principally*, the “added reasons” are also contained and proofs “which are added in order to explain and illustrate”; and therefore those things are not thought to be solemnly defined which are “in passing or incidentally said, and which are usually stated indirectly, especially the arguments adduced for the proof of a definitive judgment: Although these have grave authority, nevertheless they are not yet infallible definitions.”²⁰ But the remaining *principal and direct assertions of the Chapters*, although they contain doctrine much more extensive than what corresponds strictly to the *Canons*, must all be thought to be solemnly defined, and they must be presented to the faithful as true statements of the living Magisterium, that is, according to the excellent criterion which was stated by the Vatican Council itself: “The Decrees and Canons of the Council are to be understood *always in the sense intended by the Fathers* when they drafted them.”²¹

Therefore in the Synods of *Trent* and *Vatican I* solemn definitions were made *positively and directly in the Chapters* of the Decrees. But *negatively and indirectly solemn definitions* can be derived certainly and immediately *from the contrary errors* which are condemned in the *Canons*.

What we have said about the *Chapters*, we think can also be applied to the Preambles, because of the great diligence with which they were composed. However, this does not stand with complete certitude: for, the *Secretary*, Archbishop Simor, in the name of the *Committee for the Faith*, said this about the Preface to the *Constitution on the Catholic Faith* (D 3000) in the *Vatican Council*: “Since the Preface, even though it is placed before the *Chapters* on faith and Catholic doctrine, still does not pertain to the faith, to the doctrine itself, and it is readily understood that it can be conceived by this or another reason, and expressed with these or other words” (Msi 51,127).

909. Scholium 2. The distinction of Vatican I between what must be *believed* and what must be *held*.

A twofold supposition underlies the decrees of the Vatican Council: a) it infallibly

18. T. Granderath, *Constit. Dogmat. Sacrosancti Oecumen. Conc. Vaticani* (1892) p.74 note 1; J. Kleutgen, *Theol. Der Vorzeit* (1860) t.1 n.50; Scheeben, *Dogmatik* t.1 n.562; Huarte, *De Gratia* n.126-129; Pesch, *Praelect.* T.1 n.454; Id., *Compend.* T.1 n.311. In treatises *On the Church*: Tanqueray, n.966; Wilmers, n.221; De Groot, q.13 a.3; Bainvel, n.133,7; Straub, n.832.1027; Billot, 432; Muncunill, n.605; Felder, 258 note 3; Lercher, n.481; Schultes, 461.626; Dieckmann, n.745; Dorsch, 340; Zapelena, t.2 p.181; Stolz, 54; Schlagenhafen, n.480; Calcagno, n.358.

19. *The Secretary*, in the name of the *Committee for the Faith*, at Vatican I: Msi 51,292.

20. St. R. Bellarmine, *De Concil. et Ecclesia* l.2 c.12; I.B. Franzelin, *De Traditione* th.12 chol.1 princ.1 corol.5. There are other testimonies in Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.223,4; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* 454f. See M. Cano, *De locis* l.5 c.5 q.4.

21. A. Filippi, Bishop of Aquileia: Msi 51,133.

proposes divinely revealed doctrine *to be believed with divine faith*. b) but it infallibly proposes doctrine necessarily connected with revealed truths which is *to be held absolutely*.²²

In what we say in numbers 909-913 we are following the criterion of interpretation prescribed by the Church in these words: "*Nothing is understood to be declared or defined dogmatically, unless it is manifestly certain*"; CIC can. 1323 § 3 [1917].

To be believed. This word in its proper sense occurs in this Vatican definition: "Further, all those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith that are contained in the word of God, written or handed down, and which by the Church, either in solemn judgment or through her ordinary and universal teaching office, are proposed for belief as having been divinely revealed" (D 3011). This paragraph was introduced at the suggestion of the Bishop of Regensburg in order that in the *Constitution on Faith* there should be a definition of what *the material object of faith is that must be professed by all*.²³ According to that, it is determined to be proposed by the Council that all those things are to be *believed* that are "divinely revealed" and are contained in the sources of revelation. Therefore, things that certainly have been *revealed* are to be *believed*.

The Vatican Fathers adopted the same criterion when they decided to define the infallibility of the Roman Pontiff as "a *divinely revealed* dogma," according to this norm given to them: "For the dogmatic definition of pontifical infallibility it is necessary and sufficient that the Fathers of the Council are certain from the proper sources of divine revelation that it has been *divinely revealed*; and therefore the office and task of the Fathers is to explain and propose with authority this truth of the divine deposit according to its character."²⁴

We have an excellent interpretation of this same criterion in the Bull "*Munificentissimus Deus*," in which Pius XII recalls this doctrine of Vatican I and applies it strictly in order to define solemnly the dogma of the Assumption.²⁵

The things that are proposed *as to be believed*, are signified by the words of the definition explicitly or implicitly, directly or indirectly, equivalently or consequently, according to the various criteria that are wont to be used commonly by theologians.

910. To be held. Besides the things to be believed, Vatican I intended also to propose infallibly other things which "properly speaking are not matters of faith." For the *pre-synodal Commission of Theologians*, when it was dealing with the material to be included in the decrees of the Council, determined "that in the exposition of doctrine, besides those things that pertain to the faith, let those truths also be indicated and declared, which, although they do not properly pertain to faith, nevertheless are *certain* and *not doubtful*, and which pertain to the doctrine of the Catholic Church." But it pro-

22. This distinction is a necessary conclusion of the Vatican distinction of the primary and secondary object of infallibility, which we treated in theses 16 and 17.

23. See above n.552. From there the Church derives the definition of a *heretic*: CIC 1323, 1325. L. Garzend, *L'Inquisition et l'Hérésie* (1912); A. Deneffe, *Dogma: Wort und Begriff*: Schol 6 (1931) 381-400, 505-530; A. Lang, *Der Bedeutungswandel der Begriffe "fides" und "haeresis"*: MünchThZt 4 (1953) 133-146.

24. Msi 52,24f. On this point read the first and third norms in the same place.

25. AAS 42 (1950) 756f.770; see M. Labourdette and J. Nicolas, *La définition de l'Assomption*: RevThom 50 (249-267; P. Franquesa, *El argumento de Tradición según la Bulla "Munificentissimus Deus"*: EstMar 12 (1952) 67-9.

posed these things to be defined *as to be held* as “certain and not doubtful”; for, since in the decree on Matrimony it was said: “and henceforth let no one dare *to believe*,” one of the consulters pointed out: “Since the word “to believe” indicates an act of faith, and not all the things that are contained in the doctrinal Chapters are dogmas of faith, therefore for the word “to believe” the word “to hold” could be substituted”; and in fact that is what was done.²⁶

The proper meaning of the word “hold” in Vatican I is deduced from the decree in which it is defined that the Roman Pontiff is infallible “when he defines *ex cathedra* a doctrine concerning faith or morals to be held” (D 3074). The Bishop of Regensburg, who, as we have seen, first proposed the paragraph about *what is to be believed*, was also the leader among those who fought so that the expression “*to be held*” should prevail in the definition of infallibility. Now while explaining the formula proposed by himself, he clarified the force of this word, and said: “It says *what is to be held*; for, this phrase is used in the words of the first Constitution on the faith, in which one reads in chapter 3: ‘which are proposed by the Church... *to be believed*.’ There it is dealing with the articles of faith; therefore, since the concern here is with an object, not *to be believed with divine faith*, but *to be held infallibly*, likewise it can be said: what is proposed *to be held*.”²⁷

The meaning of the word *hold*, in contrast to the word *believe*, is clarified further from the *contradictory judgment*, in which the Council preferred it to other words. We know the history of this discussion and its particular difficulties from the *Daily Diary* of the Bishop of Regensburg, from the dissertation about this matter which Th. Grandérath wrote, and especially from the *Acts of the Council*.²⁸ From these sources it is clear that some Fathers wanted it to be said that the Roman Pontiff is infallible when he defines something *ex Cathedra* as *to be believed with divine faith* or as *to be held with faith*; and therefore they chose this restrictive formula, because they thought that it could not be defined that the object of *infallibility* is something other than what had already been defined by the Council as an object of Catholic and *divine faith* (D 3011).

Others contradicted them strenuously, and after a lengthy debate the formula prevailed of those who maintained with the Bishop of Regensburg that the object of infallibility is in general the doctrine, which *ex cathedra* is proposed *as to be held*. Therefore the first formula was rejected, because the object of infallibility seemed to be restricted to revealed truths only, which are the proper object of divine faith. Therefore the second formula was chosen and sanctioned, because, since it was certain that the *object of infallibility* is broader than the *object of divine faith*, the more ample formula was preferred,

26. *Praesynodalis theologico-dogmatica Commissio* : Msi 49,619-621; *The Method* to be observed: Msi 49,654f; Outline on Matrimony: Msi 49,652; 51,719.

27. The two Fathers, who were leaders in this matter, were Manning, the Archbishop of Westminster, and Senesrey, the Bishop of Regensburg. For his words which we cited see: CL 7,1713.

28. *Ratisbonensis Acta*: Msi 53,276-86; Th. Grandérath, *Constitutiones dogmaticae Concilii Vaticani* p.190-210.

which did not seem to exclude truths *connected with revealed truths*.²⁹

The word *hold* in the same *specific* and proper sense was used and explained in the definition of infallibility which was prepared concerning truths connected with revealed truths.³⁰ Therefore there is no doubt that Vatican I in its constitutions intended to distinguish divinely revealed truths, which it defined *as to be believed*, from truths connected with revealed truths, which it defined *as to be held*.

911. Scholium 3. The Vatican canons—*do they condemn only heresies in the strict sense?* With reference to *Trent*, which the Vatican Fathers proposed to themselves as their model, P. Kleutgen in his *Notes* to the Outline on the Church did not hesitate to write: "In the Canons of Trent on the Holy Eucharist and the sacrifice of the Mass, and also on Matrimony, certainly not a few things are defined, which per se cannot be said to be *revealed*."³¹ With regard to Vatican I, *this question is raised only concerning the Constitution on Faith*. Favre thinks that in it the Canons, which treat either the plain *preambles of faith* or *philosophical doctrines* connected with revealed truths, are better explained if they are taken as definitions whereby not strict *heresies* are condemned, but *errors*.³²

It is quite certain that the *pre-synodal Commission* adopted this norm for itself: "Let the following be proscribed: 1) in the articles of the *Canons* only *heresies*, 2) but in the *Chapters* of doctrines also the remaining *errors*, which are considered worthy of condemnation." However, in redrafting the outline of the *Constitution on the Faith* the *Commission* itself abandoned the division into *Chapters* and *Canons*, because it desired "that in each case *the grade of censure* should correspond perfectly with the *grades of error*."³³

In the discussion the Fathers asked that "*while the same doctrine remains and the same condemnation of errors*, let the draft according to the form be changed" so that "first the doctrine of the Church is proposed, and then the *Canons* should be added in which *errors* opposed to Catholic doctrine are condemned."³⁴ That is what was done, and so the doctrines, which *under various censures* were rejected in the preceding outline—some as *heretical* and other as *erroneous*, in the revised outline simply, without any difference in the censures, are condemned *by an anathema*, "*while the same condemnation remains*."

29. Msi 51,701f; 52,317, 1241, 1334; 53,251, 255f, 275, 281ff.; J. Salaverri, *Autoridad de Suarez en el Conc. Vaticano*: EstEcl 22 (1948) 220-24; see C. Damen, *De submissione Encyclicis "Humani generis"*: EuntDoc 3 (1951) 46f. We disagree with F.G. Martinez, *A propósito de la llamada "fe eclesíastica"*: RevEspT 11 (1951) 241-53.

30. In the draft prepared by P. Kleutgen: Msi 53,313.324f.

31. Msi 53,329. A Tridentine theologian, M. Pérez Ayala, that the *obstinacy* of disobedience is condemned under an *anathema*, not only against *faith* and the *divine law*, but also against a *judgment* and *precept of the Church*: *De divinis apostol. et eccles. Traditionibus* (Paris 1549) p.3 a.5 fl.247-62. Pesch holds that some Canons of Trent are contrary to *errors*, which are not strictly *heretical*, *Praelect.* 1 n.454; Scheeben, *Dogmatik* 1 n.562; R. Favre, *Les condamnations avec anathema*: BullLittEcl 47 (1946) 226-41; 48 (1q947) 31-48; P. Fransen, *Die Formel "si quis dixerit Ecclesiam errare" ...der Trienter Konzils*: Schol 25 (1950) 492-517; 26 (1951) 191-221.

32. R. Favre, *loc.cit.*: BullLittEcl 48 (1947) 46-48.

33. Msi 49,654; 50,59-119. Read the explanation of the first outline given by its principal author, Fr. Franzelin, in the presence of the committee for faith: Msi 50,319-335.

34. Msi 50,126-312, 319-28. The reason for the redrafting of the outline is explained by Bishop Martin, who made the change with Archbishop Dechamps and Bishop Pie and with the help of P. Kleutgen: Msi 53,161-177; 51,38-40. The *Secretary*, Archbishop Simor, explains the same thing at great length: Msi 51,43-45.66.

912. In the discussion of the revised outline the Fathers proposed many amendments to the *Canons*. The *Secretary*, Bishop Gasser, in the name of the *Committee for the Faith*, on the occasion of responding to amendments to 28 and 29, solved various kinds of objections which had been made against the *Canons*.

Some rejected *all the Canons* and proposed "that having abandoned the ancient form of *anathemas*, errors but not persons should be condemned in this form: We reject and condemn the *errors* of those who, 1) deny there is one true God... the Creator...." This was rejected, "because in the proposed introductory formula it is not said under what title and for what reason the *heresies* are condemned."³⁵ That is, since among the condemned propositions many are *heretical* and in condemning those propositions the different grades of censures are wont to be expressed, a *specific* censure of *error* is not sufficient, so the *generic* form of *anathemas* should be retained, under which both *heresies* and *errors* are considered to be condemned.

Others, assuming that by the *Canons* only *heresies* in the strict sense are being condemned, strongly attacked the *Canons* touching on *errors* concerning the *preambles of faith* and concerning *philosophical doctrines*. To them the *Secretary*, Gasser, responded in general that *anathemas* of this kind are necessary in order to overturn "the very pernicious judgment" of those who think, "in religious matters *nothing is held for certain*, but only opinions more or less probable exist" (Msi 51,195).

But they insisted and said that those who deny the *preambles of faith* are *unbelievers*, and therefore an *anathema* in no way affects them. The *Secretary* answered them: even though they are unbelievers, still they are *baptized*, and so they can be *judged* by the Church. And he added, the same *anathemas* are also directed against those who "under the appearance of truth believe that the systems of philosophers, even if they are pantheistic, can be reconciled with Catholic truth."³⁶

Then some others said that these men should not be condemned with an *anathema*, because they have merited well of the Church and humbly submit themselves to the decrees of the Holy See. To these the *Secretary* said: "I deny that the *anathemas* are directed against such men; for, all the *anathemas* are directly *only* against those who *obstinately* contradict the Church and *obstinately defend an error rejected by the Church*."³⁷

But others insisted: "Faith condemns *heretics of faith* and reason *heretics of reason*...lest faith be too involved in *philosophical matters*; for, the approved *Canons* are the *faith* of previous centuries, they are the *rule of salvation*. To this Gasser replied suitably: "The Church, as you know, should not only condemn *heresies*; but also reject and condemn *errors*, to the extent that they concern *certain doctrine*."³⁸

If the *Secretary for the Faith* had admitted the supposition of the objectors, namely, that only strictly *heretical* propositions should be condemned, then the simple and most effective response to all these objections would be this: The propositions condemned *under anathema* are all *heretical*, and therefore all the proposed *Canons*, from the sup-

35. Kenrick, Hefele, Fitzgerald, Schwarzenberg, and others: Msi 51,63.103.183.402f. For the response of the *Secretary* see: Msi 51,196.

36. Dubreil, Rivet, Place, and others: Msi 51,103ff.183.207.308.404; Gasser: Msi 51,195.

37. Greith, Edler, and others: Msi 50,211; 51,403. The *Secretary* Gasser: Msi 51,195.

38. Dubreil, Simor, Marquerye, and others: Msi 51,103ff.43f.; Gasser Msi 51,196.

position itself of the objectors, should be admitted. But Gasser did not say this except with regard to two amendments, proposed against two of these *Canons*, in which the Synod intended to condemn not *mere errors* against the preambles of faith, but *heresies* in the full and proper sense.³⁹

From these points we can conclude with probability that among the *Canons* of the *Constitution on the Faith* some are found about which it is not clearly certain that they were directed against *heresies in the strict sense*, namely, those about which in this Council there was some dispute. Therefore, how do we *discern* which *Canons* deal strictly with *heretics*? We do it from the *doctrine of the corresponding Chapters*, for, "between the doctrine which is found in the Chapters of the *Constitution on the Faith* and the doctrine which is found in the *Canons* there is no difference other than what there is between the *positive* doctrine on the faith and the *negative*" (Msi 51,415; 52,1229d).

913. Conclusion. Therefore the distinction between what is *to be believed* and what is *to be held* underlies the *Constitutions* of Vatican I; this follows as a conclusion of theses 16 and 17 on the *twofold* object of infallibility. We find this distinction already expressed by Vitoria: "I say that in order for a proposition to be a matter of *faith*, it is required that the Council determine that it is to be held as a *matter of faith*. Concerning the existence of Purgatory, it was determined by the Council of Florence that there is a Purgatory and that this is certain from Holy Scripture. However, not everything determined as *true* is therefore a *matter of faith*; but whatever is determined as a *matter of faith* must be *believed* as a *matter of faith*. This therefore is required."⁴⁰

Often, however, the authors do not use this distinction, and when they see that some doctrine has been *defined* by the Church, for that very fact they say that it is *of faith*, thus taking this denomination in a *generic* sense, according to this sentence of St. Thomas: "Something pertains to *faith* in two ways: in one way *directly* and principally, like the *articles of faith*; in another way *indirectly* and secondarily, like those things *from which* follows the denial of some article. And concerning both there can be *heresy* in the way in which there is also *faith*."⁴¹

Generally the authors speak in this *generic* sense, also those about whom at Vatican I P. Kleutgen said: "These theologians say that something is a *dogma of faith*, in order to distinguish a proposition *defined* by apostolic authority from a proposition of a private teacher, but not in order to distinguish a proposition *under a note of heresy* from a proposition *under a minor censure*."⁴²

39. Gandolfi, Ballerini, *Trevirensis*: Msi 51,90f.107ff.183f.; Gasser Msi 51,196.198.

40. F. de Vitoria, *In* 2.2 q.1 a.10 n.3,4; he teaches the same thing in q.11 a.2 n.7,2.

41. S.Th. I, q.32, a. 4; II-II, q. 11, a. 2; *In* 1 Cor 11,19 lect.4. The same doctrine is proposed by D. Báñez, *In* 2.2 q.11 a.2; G. de Valentia, *In* 1 q.32 a.4; dp.2 q.6 pt.3; F. Sylvius, *In* 2.2 q.11 a.2; M. Cano, *De locis theologicis* l.12 c.6; and many others. See Marín-Sola, *La evolución homogénea del dogma*, n.453ff.

42. Ios. Kleutgen, *Annotationes in schema II de Ecclesia*: Msi51,329. See J.B. Franzelin, *De Traditione* p.124f.; L. Garzend, *L'Inquisition et l'Hérésie* (19120; A. Deneffe, *Dogma: Wort und Begriff*: Schol 6 (1931) 381-400, 505-530; A. Lang, *Der Bedeutungswandel der Begriffe "fides" und "haeresis"*: MünchThZt 4 (1953) 133-146.

B O O K I I I

ON THE SUPERNATURAL NATURE AND
PROPERTIES OF THE CHURCH

C H A P T E R I

On the supernaturality and eminence of the Church

A R T I C L E I

ON THE END OF THE CHURCH

Note. Now since in the preceding book the theses on the ecclesiastical Magisterium were proved, and also theses concerning her Sources and Criteria, in this present book III we can with full justification use *the dogmatic method*.

Thesis 22. The end of the Church is the supernatural sanctification or salvation of men.

914. S.Th., see III, q. 8, a. 3 ad 2; Franzelin, th.20; Wilmers, th.6-8; Straub, th.9f.; De Groot, q.2 a.3; Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1911) 209-230; Muncunill, n.101-104; D'Herbigny, n.48-53; Schultes, a.11; Michelitsch, § 178.180; Dieckmann, n.800-918; Dorsch, p.504-511; Lercher, th.36; Zapelena 2 (1954) th.22.

915. Connection. *In the first part* of our treatise we proved that Christ instituted the Church as a hierarchical and monarchical society, which is the Kingdom of Christ on earth. *In the second part* we showed that Christ instituted in the Church an authentic and infallible Magisterium to teach revealed truth. Finally, *in the third part*, while leaving to the treatise on the Sacrament of Orders questions about the institution of the Priesthood in the Church for the sanctification of men, now we intend to investigate the intimate nature of the Church, which corresponds above all to her office of sanctifying that was proved in thesis 3.¹

But since it is certain that the nature of a society is known especially from its *end* or social good,² therefore in this first thesis of the third part we

1. We already proved in thesis 3 that Christ conferred on the Church in general the power of sanctifying.

2. S.Th. I-II, q. 1, a. 3; II-II, q. 174, a.2.

inquire into the proper end of the Church.

916. Definition of terms. The *end* is that because of which something is done. But the end of the Church can be considered in three ways: a) *from the part of God*, and then the end of the Church is nothing other than the glory of God; b) *from the part of Christ*, and then the end of the Church is “to continue for all time the saving work of redemption”³; c) *from the part of the members of the Church*, and then the end of the Church is the supernatural good of men.⁴ We are treating the end of the Church under this third aspect, since we are inquiring into its social good; in order to obtain this end the Church was instituted and born.

A twofold end of the Church is distinguished: one is proximate and the other is remote. a) The *proximate end* is that which the Church intends immediately to obtain on earth, which is the supernatural sanctification or salvation, or the first and beginning salvation in this earthly life.

b) The *remote end* is that which the Church, after having obtained the proximate end, finally intends to obtain, which is the supernatural sanctification or the second and consummated salvation in eternal life, that is, in the eschatological Kingdom.

917. The *sanctification* or salvation of man in general consists in his right ordination to God as to his beginning and end, or in the moral union of man with God.⁵ But *union with God* of this kind is distinguished into two forms: a) The *natural* is that which results from abstract knowledge of God, to the extent that the divinity truly can be known by the powers of nature, and from the proportioned resulting love of God; b) The *supernatural* is that which results from the knowledge of God obtained by powers above nature, that is, either by faith on earth or by vision in heaven, and from the resulting love of God. This supernatural *salvation* is called *first or inchoative*, which is had through faith and grace in this earthly life; but it is called *second or consummated*, which is had through the vision of God and love in eternal life.

The internal nature and the various grades of supernaturality are considered in the treatises *On Grace* and *On God the Creator and Sanctifier*.⁶ For now it is sufficient for us to speak about sanctification in general or salvation, which Christ brought to men, and which men obtain, not through a merely abstract knowledge of God from created

3. *Vatican Council I, Constitut. De Ecclesia Christi*: D 3050.

4. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 thesis 22.

5. II-II, q. 81, a.8; 3 CG 130.

6. See B. Beraza, *De Deo elevante* (1924) s.1 c.1f.

things, but through faith in the revelation of the divine Legate; and not through a merely natural love of God, but through a celestial charity, the example of which for us is the Son of God himself. Therefore, the *sanctification* and salvation, about which we are speaking, surely implies cleanliness from sins and union with God, but according to the doctrine and law, which Christ, the divine Legate and Son of God, handed on to us.⁷

918. State of the question. In the thesis *we are asserting positively* that the end of the Church is the supernatural sanctification of men and salvation to be initiated here on earth and to be consummated in eternal life; but *we are prescinding* from the question whether or not this supernatural salvation can be obtained *exclusively* through the Church and in the Church, because we will treat the doctrine on this point in thesis 28.

919. Adversaries. 1) Very many *Protestants*, especially *Calvinists*, who hold that Christ conferred on the Church the bare ministry of preaching the Gospel, but deny for the ministers of the Church all true power of sanctifying: see D 1771. Likewise *Lutherans* teach that the supernatural sanctification or salvation of men is accomplished *immediately by God in individual persons* through fiducial faith alone, and therefore not through the power of sanctifying or through other means of salvation instituted by Christ and committed to the Ministers of the Church: see D 1460-1463, 1559, 1562-1564.

2) All *Naturalists* and *Rationalists*, who refuse to admit the supernatural order and those things that exceed the light of reason; and therefore they try to explain as merely natural phenomena everything that is seen to be supernatural in the Sources of revelation or that exceeds the powers of reason; or they reject such things as pure figments of imagination.

3) *Modernists* are very much like the preceding adversaries, since they try to explain through evolution the merely natural human origin of all means of salvation, which having come from Christ are present in the Church: see the Decree "*Lamentabili*," D 3440-3450.

920. Doctrine of the Church. *Vatican Council I* implicitly teaches our doctrine in the Introduction to *Constitution I on the Church*: D 3050-3052. Pius IX, in the *Encyclical "Etsi multa luctuosa,"* explicitly teaches: "a twofold order of things exists, and at the same time two powers are to be distinguished on earth, one natural... the other whose origin is above nature, which presides over the city of God, namely, the Church of Christ, divinely established for the peace and the eternal salvation of souls": D 1841 [34th ed.]. But Leo XIII no less explicitly, in the *Encyclical "Immortale Dei,"* says: "Just as Jesus Christ came on earth that men may have life and have

7. Pseudo-Dionysius, *De divinis nominibus* c.12,2; II-II, q. 81, a.8: MG 3,970.

it abundantly (John 10:10), in the same way the Church has for its purpose the eternal salvation of souls.”⁸ The same Pontiff without hesitation often teaches the same doctrine in the *Encycl. “Satis cognitum”*: D 3303 (ASS 28,712.723f.).

Pius XI openly teaches the same doctrine in the *Encycl. “Divini illius Magistri”*: D 3685, and in the very first words with which in 1930 he began his *Encyclical “Ad salutem”*: “His provident care established the Church for the salvation of the human race.”

Finally, Pius XII teaches the same doctrine in the *Encycl. “Mystici Corporis Christi”* when he says: “Just as the Son of the eternal Father came down from heaven for the eternal salvation of all of us, so he founded the Body of the Church and enriched it with his Divine Spirit to procure and acquire the beatitude of immortal souls.” “The Christian society, by the will of its Founder, exists as a social and perfect Body... whose highest end is this: the continuing sanctification of the members of the Body itself for the glory of God and the Lamb” (AAS 35,222.226).

For *Vatican Council I* this further explicit definition was prepared: “If any one says that the Church of Christ is not altogether necessary to obtain eternal salvation... let him be anathema.” In this canon the necessity of the Church for salvation is directly defined; but by that very fact it is clearly presupposed that its end or purpose positively is this salvation.⁹

921. Theological note. *The thesis is Catholic Doctrine, proximate to a definition, from the cited Encyclicals and from Vatican I. It can also be said to be of divine faith, because it is found formally contained in the Sources of revelation.*

922. Proof. 1) The Church was instituted for the purpose of continuing the mission of Christ. But the end of the mission of Christ is the supernatural sanctification or salvation of men. Therefore, the end of the Church is the supernatural sanctification or salvation of men.

The major is very certain from the second and third theses, in which we proved the divine institution of the Church. Therefore, let it suffice to call to mind the other testimonies of the Gospels quoted at that time: Matt. 28:18; Luke 10:16; John 17:18; 20:21.

The major is proved further, because Christ commanded the Apostles at the Last Supper that they should do until He comes again, what the Lord was then doing; but Jesus then offered with his words the sacrifice of blood of the New Testament for the remission of sins: Matt. 26:26-28; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor. 11:23-27 (D 1739-1741, 1752). Finally, the same

8. Leo XIII, *Encycl. “Immortale Dei”*: ASS 18,164.

9. *Vatican Council I, De Ecclesia, Schema I* cn.5,8 and 13; *Schema II* cn.6 and 15: Msi 51,551f.

major is *confirmed* by the mind of the Apostles, who show themselves as *Servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God*: 1 Cor. 3:5; 4:1; 2 Cor. 5:18-20; but in these concepts of “servant” and “ministry” (διάκονος, ὑπηρέτης, διακονία) St. Paul openly includes the idea of continuation and ministerial participation in the work of Christ himself, because of whose command the Apostles are only His administrators.¹⁰

The minor is proved easily from the meaning of the name of Jesus, for He will save his people from their sins: Matt. 1:21; from the end because of which the Lord himself clearly testified that he came *to seek and to save the lost*: Luke 19:10; from the clear mission of the Father, by which *he sent his Son into the world... so that the world might be saved through him*: John 3:14-18; from the manifest reason, whereby Christ made known his intention and the will of the Father, saying: *I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me... For this is the will of my Father, that everyone who sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life* (John 6:38-40).

923. *The minor is confirmed further from the words and writings of the Apostles.*

From St. Peter: there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved (Acts 4:12).

From St. Paul: God sent forth his Son... so that we might receive adoption as sons (Gal. 4:4-7).

From St. John: The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil. You know that he appeared to take away sins. God sent his Son into the world to be the expiation for our sins, that we might live through him (John 3:1-8; 4:9-10).

924. Proof. 2) *The end of the office of the Church is the supernatural salvation of men. Therefore the end of the Church is the same supernatural salvation of men.*

a) *The end or the purpose of the office of teaching is salvation. For, preach, he said, the Gospel to the whole creation; he who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will be condemned* (Mark 16:15). St. Paul says the same thing beautifully when he teaches that the mission of teaching is conferred in order to preach; that preaching is

10. See F. Zorell, *Novi Testamenti lexicon graecum*; see J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el Misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 263-267. See St. Augustine, *In Io 15,1* tr. 80 n.2 and *In Io 2,27* tr.3 n.13: ML 35,1839.2005.

necessary so that men will believe in Christ, confess him and call upon his name; that the confession of Christ and calling upon him is done in order to obtain salvation. Therefore the purpose of the mission of teaching is the salvation of men (Rom. 10:9-15).

925. b) *The purpose of the office of ruling* is the salvation of men. For, the office of ruling in the Church is a continuation of Christ's office of feeding his flock, as is certain from the text by which the Primacy is conferred on St. Peter (John 21:15-17). But the purpose of Christ's office of feeding is the supernatural salvation of men, as the Lord himself said in the Parable of the Good Shepherd (John 10:11.16.26-28). Therefore the end or purpose of the office of ruling is the supernatural sanctification or salvation of men. This same point can be proved from St. Paul (1 Thess. 4:1-8), who insistently warns that the way of acting and the precepts given to the faithful are required, because *This is the will of God, your sanctification* (vv.3f.7).

926. It is easily apparent that *the purpose of the office of sanctifying* is the supernatural sanctification and salvation of men, first of all from the true concept of "ministry," which according to St. Paul is not reduced to a bare action of preaching the Gospel, as the Protestants desire, but also implies the power of truly producing sanctification, not of course principally and on one's own right, but as an instrument and by a vicarious right, so that the ministers are truly "servants of God through whom Christ brings about salvation": Rom. 15:15f.; 1 Cor. 3:5-9; 4:1; 2 Cor. 5:20.

The same thing is proved from the end of the office of sanctifying in each one of the Sacraments.

In Baptism the end is the supernatural rebirth from the Holy Spirit (John 3:3-5); *in Confirmation* the end is the conferring of the gifts of the Holy Spirit (Acts 8:14-17); *in the Eucharist* the end is participation in the heavenly and eternal life whereby the faithful live because of Christ (John 6:53-58); *in Penance* the end is the true remission of sins (John 20:21-23); *in the Anointing* the end is to alleviate and save the infirm, and to remit their sins (Jas. 5:14-15); *in Orders* the end is to confer grace and power to strenuously fulfill the ministry of the Gospel (2 Tim. 1:6-9); *in Matrimony* the end is to confer grace by which the spouses may be able to imitate the union and mutual love with which Christ is united to the Church and loves her (Eph. 5:22-32).

927. Scholium 1. The Church is a supernatural society. Now that we have proved this thesis, we can deduce what *the nature of the Church is*. For, St. Thomas fitly teaches: "The excellence of the means is measured chiefly by the end," but moral acts

“properly speaking receive their species from the end.”¹¹ But since it has been proved that the end of the Church is supernatural, logically therefore we can conclude that the Church is a supernatural society, as Leo XIII clearly said with these words: “Therefore, the Church is a society divine in origin, supernatural in its end, and in the means which bring us closest to that end” (D 1959 [34th ed.]). Finally, Pius XI in the *Encyclical “Divini illius Magistri,”* declared the supernaturality of the Church when he wrote: “Now there are three necessary societies, distinct from one another... of these two, namely, the *family* and *civil society*, belong to the natural order; the third, the *Church*, to the *supernatural order*..., into which man is born when through baptism he reaches the divine life of grace” (D 3685). Finally, Pius XII teaches the same thing in the *Encyclical “Mystici Corporis,”* when he says: “Christian society is raised to a level that completely surpasses every order of nature” (AAS 35,223). Therefore, notions taken from natural social entities can be predicated of the Church only *analogically*.

From this outstanding dignity of the Church is inferred further the “supernatural love” which the faithful are held to show towards her.¹² “For the Church is the holy land of the living God, born of God himself, and established by the same Author, who indeed is on a pilgrimage in the land; calling men, and training and leading them to eternal happiness in heaven. Therefore, the fatherland must be loved, from which we receive the enjoyment of mortal life; but we must love the Church more to whom we owe the love of the soul which will last forever” (*ibid.*). Hence rightly does St. Augustine admonish us: “Let us believe, brothers, that each one loves the Church to the extent that he has the Holy Spirit,” who “as the fount of grace, of gifts and of all charisms perpetually and intimately fills the Church and works in her.”¹³

928. Scholium 2. On the Church as our Mother. St. Paul, Gal.

4:26, says: “The Jerusalem above is free, and she is our mother (or of all of us).” The Councils of *Lateran IV* and *Lyons II* call the Church “the mother and teacher of all the faithful”: D 807, 811, 850. Pius XI speaks about the “supernatural office of the Church as Mother” (Encycl. “*Divini illius Magistri*” D 3686). Finally, Pius XII says beautifully that the Church is our Mother by reason of her threefold ordinary office of sanctifying, teaching and ruling, and also by reason of the gifts and charisms by which she multiplies the number of the saints: “Certainly our holy Mother shows herself without stain in the *Sacraments* with which she begets and nurtures her children; in the *faith* which she preserves ever inviolate; in the holy *laws* which she imposes on all and in the evangelical counsels by which she admonishes; and, finally, in the heavenly gifts and miraculous powers by which out of her inexhaustible fecundity she begets countless hosts of martyrs, virgins and confessors. But she cannot be blamed if

11. I-II, q. 1, a. 3; II-II, q. 174, a. 2.

12. Leo XIII, *Encycl. “Sapientiae christianae”*: D 1936a-b [34th ed.].

13. St. Augustine, *In Joan.* 32,8: ML 35,1645f.; Pius XII, “*Mystici Corporis*,” AAS (1943) 223.

some of her members are sick or wounded. It is in their name that she always prays daily to God: "Forgive us our trespasses," applying herself straightway with *motherly* and valiant heart to their spiritual healing." Wherefore rightly Pius XII himself exhorts all to practice perfect love of God, saying: "Before concluding this Letter, We feel constrained insistently to exhort one and all to love *Holy Mother Church* with a zealous and practical love" (Encycl. "*Mystici Corporis*": AAS 35,225.237-247).

This teaching of St. Paul and of the ecclesiastical Magisterium is contained abundantly in the monuments of *Tradition*. The teaching of the holy Fathers has been collected by J. Madoz, *Mater Ecclesia: EstEcl* 16(1942) 433-452; J. Plumpe, *Mater Ecclesia, an Inquiry in the Concept of the Church as Mother in Early Christianity* (1943); S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (1946) p.41-44. The teaching of St. Augustine on this matter is explained by P. Batiffol, *Le Catholicisme de S. Augustin* (1920) p.271-276; P. Rinetti, *Sant'Agostino e l'Ecclesia Mater: Augustinus Magister* (1954) 827-834. A more ample inquiry up to the year 1000 is given to us by H. Rahner, *Mater Ecclesia. Lobpreis der Kirche aus der ersten Jahrtausend* (1944). Good syntheses of the doctrine are offered to us by J.M. Bover, *Maternité de Marie et de l'Eglise* in H. du Manoir, *Maria I* (1949) 668-674; M. Philipon, *Maternité spirituelle de Marie et de l'Eglise: EtudMar* (1952) 63-86; H. de Lubac, *L'Eglise notre Mère: Etud* 276 (1953) 3-19; Id., *Méditation sur l'Eglise* (1953) ch.7 p.183-212, *Ecclesia Mater*.

929. Scholium 3. There is a twofold end of the Church. All Catholic Theologians agree in teaching that the supernatural end of the Church is the sanctification or salvation of men. However, some distinguish a threefold end of the Church, namely, a *proximate end*, which they place in the exercise of the Christian religion, a *remote end*, which they say is the sanctification of souls in this life, and *the last end*, which they say consists in the possession of eternal happiness. Thus, among those holding this opinion are Wilmers and Van Laak, but others, like Straub, contradict them.¹⁴ We prefer the opinion which seems to be more in agreement with the way of speaking of the ecclesiastical Magisterium, as it has been explained in our thesis. For, the exercise of the Christian religion, if it is taken as separated from the sanctification of souls and excluding that, in the proper sense cannot be said to be a social good specifying the Church; and therefore it does not assume the nature of an end, but rather it must be

14. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* th.7f.; Van Laak, *Institutiones Theologiae fundamentalis, De Ecclesia* 29; Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.330f.

said to be a pure means.

930. Objections.¹⁵ *For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself as a ransom for all (1 Tim. 2:5).* Hence the argument is made: The only Mediator is Christ, because he is the Redeemer. Therefore, there cannot be other mediators who have the office of sanctifying, because they are not redeemers.

I distinguish the antecedent. The only principal, necessary Mediator and by his own right is Christ as the Redeemer, *conceded*; the only Mediator is Christ in such a way that he excludes other mediators who are contingent, ministerial and with a participated right are invested with the office of sanctifying, *denied*. Likewise *the consequent is distinguished and the consequence denied*.¹⁶

931. 2. *The former priests were many in number, because they were prevented by death from continuing in office; but he holds his priesthood permanently, because he continues for ever... and he always lives to make intercession for us... And when he had offered for all time a single sacrifice for sins, he sat down at the right hand of God... For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are sanctified (Heb. 7:23-25; 10:12-14).* From these words an objection is made: In contrast to the plurality of priests and sacrifices, St. Paul teaches that there is one eternal Priest, Christ, endowed with the office of sanctifying. Therefore St. Paul excludes all others endowed with the office of sanctifying.

I distinguish the antecedent. In contrast to the plurality of priests and sacrifices of the Old Law, which foretold and prefigured the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, St. Paul teaches that there is one eternal Priest, Christ, endowed with the office of sanctifying, by which his foretelling and prefigurement were fulfilled and consummated, *conceded*; St. Paul teaches that in the New Law there is simply one and eternal priesthood endowed with the office of sanctifying, *I subdistinguish*: St. Paul teaches that in the New Law there is simply one and eternal priesthood of Christ whereby on the cross Christ by his own power made satisfaction for the sins of all and merited all graces for us, *conceded*; St. Paul teaches that in the New Law there is not a ministerial priesthood by which, sharing in the power coming from Christ, the fruits of the satisfaction and merits of Christ the Redeemer are applied to us, *denied*.

15. See Schultes, *De Ecclesia* 87f. Van Laak, *Instit. De Ecclesia* p.216f.

16. S.Th., *Super I epist. S. Pauli ad Timotheum expositio* c.2 lect.1.

I also distinguish the consequent. St. Paul excludes all the priests and all their sacrifices of the Old Law, *conceded*; of the New Law, *I subdistinguish*: high priests and bloody sacrifices, whereby by their own power satisfaction is made to God for sins and graces are merited, *conceded*; ministerial priests and unbloody sacrifices, whereby, sharing in the power coming from Christ, the fruits of the satisfaction and of the merits of Christ are applied to us, *denied*.¹⁷

932. 3. Supernatural salvation once for all was perfected and consummated by the death of Christ: *For by a single offering he has perfected for all time those who are sanctified* (Heb. 10:14). Therefore supernatural salvation cannot be the end to be obtained by the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Salvation was consummated by the death of Christ objectively and in the first reality, that is, on the part of Christ, inasmuch as Christ by his death already satisfied perfectly for sins and merited grace for us, *conceded*; subjectively and in the second reality, that is, on the part of men, inasmuch as the fruits of the satisfaction and merits of Christ already have been applied to men, *denied*. Likewise *the consequent is distinguished and the consequence denied*.

933. 4. That which is the fruit of sanctification cannot be the means to the end of sanctification. But the Church is the fruit of sanctification. Therefore the Church cannot be the means to the end of sanctification.

I distinguish the major. That which is its fruit concerning the same subject and under the same respect cannot be the means of sanctification, *conceded*; concerning a different subject or under a different respect, *denied*.

I also distinguish the minor. The Church triumphant is the *fruit of sanctification*, *conceded*; the Church militant, *I subdistinguish*: it is the fruit of sanctification inasmuch as it is a supernatural society made up of the sanctified, *conceded*; inasmuch as it is a supernatural society instituted to cause and augment sanctification in a ministerial and instrumental way, *denied*. And *according to the given distinctions, I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

934. 5. Supernatural sanctification or salvation consists finally in the infusion, preservation and increase of the gifts of grace. But these things necessarily and immediately are done by God himself. Therefore they cannot be the end to be obtained by the Church.

17. S.Th., *Super epist. S. Pauli ad Hebraeos expositio* c.7 lect.4; c.10 lect.1.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. The infusion, preservation and increase of the gifts of grace necessarily and immediately are done by God as by a necessary and principal cause, *conceded*; they are done by God necessarily and immediately so that the ministerial or instrumental influence of the Church freely arranged and used by God himself is excluded, *denied*.

Likewise I distinguish the consequent. Sanctification cannot be the end to be obtained by the Church, as through a necessary and principal cause, *conceded*; as through a ministerial or instrumental cause freely arranged and used by God, *denied*. And according to the given distinctions, *I deny the consequence*.

935. 6. A means is useless for anyone who has already obtained the end. But anyone who is in the state of grace has already obtained the end of the Church. Therefore for anyone who is in the state of grace the Church is useless.

I distinguish the major. The means is useless for anyone who has already obtained the end adequately and perfectly, *conceded*; for anyone who has obtained the end inadequately and imperfectly, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Anyone who is in the grace of heaven has already obtained the end of the Church adequately and perfectly, *conceded*; anyone who is in grace as a pilgrim on earth has already obtained the end of the Church adequately and perfectly, *denied*. And according to the given distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

ARTICLE I I

THE PERFECTION AND ABSOLUTE INDEPENDENCE
OF THE CHURCH

Thesis 23. The Church is a perfect and absolutely independent society, with full legislative, judicial and executive power.

936. S.Th. I-II, q. 90, a. 3 ad 3; *De Regim. Princ.* L.1 c.1; Suarez, *Defens. Fidei* l.3 c.5-9; Muncunill, n.309-418; Bainvel, 99.127; De Groot, 131.389; Dorsch, 242-519; Ottiger, 50.227; Straub, n.613-1074; Billot, th.20; Pesch, *Compend.* 1.233; Schultes, 260.333; Palmieri, 113; D'Herbigny, n.75; Excm. G. Martínez, *Credo S. Ecclesiam Cath.* (1954). See J. Salaverri, *El Derecho Publico Ecclesiastico en la Semana de Teología: EstEcl* 29 (1955) 54-64.

937. Connection. We have proved that Christ instituted the Church as a true society, whose end is the supernatural salvation of men. But since from the end of a society its social perfection is immediately deduced, therefore now we ask whether or not the Church in its relation to the civil society is perfect and independent, and possesses the three powers of government that belong to a perfect society.

938. Definition of terms.¹ *A society* is a moral and stable union of several persons working for a common end.

1) *A perfect society* is one that has *as its end* the full and supreme good of men in its own order, and possesses sufficient *means* really or by right (*de iure*) in order to obtain its end: the Church and the State are perfect societies.

An imperfect society is one that, *by reason of its end*, either is a part of another or subordinated to another society, and *by reason of its means*, depends on another society, which provides it with sufficient means for its end: a Province, Diocese, Religious Order, the Family are imperfect societies.

A complete society is one which *directly* procures for man the adequate good both of the body and of the soul. It will be *incomplete* if it intends directly only a good that is either spiritual or temporal. Complete = the family; incomplete = the Church.

939. An independent society is one whose authority is not justly subordinate to the authority of another society.

Two forms of dependence are distinguished: direct and indirect.

1. González Moral, *Philosophia moralis* (1945) n.920-925.

Direct is that by which the authority *by reason of itself* is rightly subject to another higher authority: the Bishop of a diocese, the Governor of a province.

Indirect is that by which the authority, not by reason of itself, but only by reason of a higher end, to which further its subjects are ordained, is subject to another authority of a higher society: the father of a family with relation to the authority of the State; the authority of the State with reference to the Church.

That society is *absolutely independent* whose supreme authority *neither directly nor indirectly* is subordinate to the authority of another society.

Some contemporary Catholic authors call into question the concept of an *indirect power* and they are inclined to deny it; they hold that the Church and the State are not *properly subject* to each other even *indirectly*, because they are independent societies and simply perfect, and so supreme in their own proper order. According to them, the true doctrine on the *indirect* subordination of the State to the Church does not understand the subjection in the true and proper sense, but intends only to establish and apply a *practical norm of prevalence* according to the order of ends, which the State is held to observe, not because *it is subordinate even indirectly* to the Church, but because it is obliged by God to procure its own end in an orderly way.²

940. 3) We have proved that the *power of governing* belongs to the Church. In fact, in a perfect society a triple function is assigned to the power of governing: legislative, judicial and executive. We are saying that the same triple functions belong to the Church.

Legislative is the power of passing laws, that is, the power of imposing stable ordinations which oblige the members of a perfect society for the efficacious obtaining of the social end.³

Judicial is the power of deciding with authority about the meaning of laws and also about disputes among citizens and about transgressions of the laws.

Executive is the power of compelling subjects to the observance of the laws by the imposition of penalties on transgressors of the laws. *Punishments* are understood not as penances, but as what is inflicted on

2. Glez, *Pouvoir du Pape en matière temporelle*: DTC 12,2750-2772; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (1941) 301f.; J. Leclercq, S.J., *L'Eglise et la souveraineté de l'Etat* (1946) c.5, Les theories du pouvoir indirect, p.96-113; L. Bender, O.P., *Ius publicum ecclesiasticum* (1948) 125; A. Stickler, *Magistri Gratiani sententia de potestate Ecclesiae in Statum*: Apol 21 (1949) 71-77; W. Onclin: EphThLov 25 (1949) 176,181; see O. Robleda, *Sobre el poder directo e indirecto de la Iglesia*: SalTer 39 (1951) 365-372; L.R. Sotillo, *Algunas notas sobre la potestad indirecta de la Iglesia*: MiscCom 16 (1951) 31-34

3. I-II, q. 90, a. 4: "The definition of law: it is nothing else than an ordinance of reason for the common good, made by him who has care of the community, and promulgated." L. Rodrigo, *Praelectiones theologico-morales* 2. *De legibus* (1944) n.3-62.

the *unwilling*; they can be *spiritual* or *also temporal*, as seems necessary according to the judgment of the supreme authority.

941. Adversaries. 1) Exaggerated *Nationalists* of all times, who either deny or at least diminish the equal independence of the Church (Gal. 5:17).

2) *The interferences of Emperors* into the affairs of the Church suppose in practice that they do not recognize the full independence of the Church. For example, in the 4th century Constantine and his successors in the cases of the Donatists and Arians; in the 5th century Theodosius II and his successors in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies; in the 6th century Justinian with his decrees on things pertaining to the discipline and doctrine of the Church; in the 7th century Constantine IV in the case of the Monotheletists; in the 8th century Leo Isauricus and his successors in the conflict over the cult of sacred images; in the 9th century Michael III showing favor to Photius (D 641-642).⁴

942. Oriental Schismatics, who defend the so-called separate *Byzantinism* and in practice subjected the Church to the Emperor. From this came later *Caesaro-papism*, which in Russia, since the time of Peter the Great (1700), has attributed all civil and religious authority to the Emperor.⁵

4) *Precursors*: a) of *Gallicanism*, at the end of the 13th century and the beginning of the 14th century, namely, *the French lawyers* under Philip IV the Fair, and Marsilius of Padua (D 873-875, 941, 943, 945).

b) *Of Protestantism*, at the end of the 14th century and the beginning of the 15th century, Wycliffe and Hus, priests (D 1162, 1166, 1209, 1271-1273).

943. 5) Protestants from the 16th century. *In Germany* in practice the axiom was observed: "Whoever controls the land determines the religion"; and Luther wrote in his book, *The Babylonian Captivity*: "nothing can be imposed on Christians by any rule of laws." *In England* among the articles of the Anglican faith, from the year 1552, this is also included: "The King of England is the supreme head on earth, after Christ, of the Anglican Church."⁶

6) *Rigid Gallicans* from the 18th century who, under the leadership of Richerio, have tried to adapt the Church in such a way that she is subject to

4. C. Silva-Tarouca, *Institutiones Historiae ecclesiasticae* part 2, *Ecclesia in Imperio Romano-Byzantino* (1933) c.1, *De Imperatore et Ecclesia*.

5. M. Jugie, *Theologia graeco-russorum* 4, *De Ecclesia*, c.9 p.598-639.

6. *Articuli Anglicani* 21q.35.36f.; K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* 513.519f.

the supreme end of national glory. *The milder Gallicans* can be added here with their articles of the Gallican clergy (D 2281-2283).⁷

944. 7) *Josephinists*, from the Emperor Joseph II (1765-90), who hold that supreme authority in everything that contributes to the common good of the citizens belongs to the State. The *Synod of Pistoia* also belongs here, which was favored by Leopold II, the brother and successor of Joseph II (D 2605f.).

8) *Liberalism* defends the separation between Church and State and denies the immunity and freedom of the Church. Hence through *Rationalism* absolute *Laicism* was introduced and also the *Statism of Socialists and Communists* (D 2894, 2919f., 2924f.). Pius XI in 1937 rejected the contemporary *Statism of Communism in the Encyclicals* "*Divini Redemptoris*" and "*Firmissimam constantiam*" and of the *German National Socialism* with his *Encyclical* "*Mit brennender Sorge*" (AAS 29 [1937] 65.145.189).

The *Modernists* belong here (D 3493), and also the *Panchristians* who want to make the Church of Christ part of some larger confederation of all Christians, and they want the Roman Pontiff to be subject to the decisions of a supreme federal Council and to be placed on the same level with other heads of the Churches.

945. Doctrine of the Church. *Against Photius, the Council of Constantinople IV* in the year 870: D 660; see D 641-642.

Against the Gallicans, Boniface VIII "*Unam Sanctam*" in 1302: D 875, and also against Marsilius of Padua, John XXII (D 941, 943), and against the followers of the Gallicans, the *Synod of Pistoia*, Pius VI "*Auctorem fidei*": D 2604 defend the correct doctrine.

Against the first Protestants, the Council of Trent, sess.23, in the year 1563: D 1767, 1777, defined the full independence of the ecclesiastical hierarchy from any human authority.

Against the liberals, laicists and statistes, Pius IX, after the middle of the 19th century: D 2893-2895; read in the "*Syllabus*" the propositions 19f., 28, 39, 41-45, 49, 51-55: D 2919ff.

946. Against the same adversaries Leo XIII published several *Encyclicals*: "*Diuturnum*," "*Immortale Dei*," "*Libertas*," "*Sapientiae christianae*," "*Rerum novarum*," between 1881 and 1891. Read what he has to say in "*Immortale Dei*" D 3169-3171. Moreover he said: "Jesus Christ gave to

7. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.76.

his Apostles unrestrained authority in regard to things sacred, together with the genuine and most true power of making laws, as also with the twofold right of judging and of punishing, which flow from that power... Now, this authority, perfect in itself, and plainly meant to be unfettered... the Church has never ceased to claim for herself and openly to exercise.”⁸

Benedict XV in 1917, when he promulgated the CIC said: “*The most provident Mother Church was so established by her Founder, Christ, that she is endowed with all the powers that pertain to any perfect society*” (the *Constitution “Providentissima”* at the beginning of the CIC).

Pius XI, when he rejects the Panchristians in 1928; and when he compares among themselves the domestic, civil and ecclesiastical societies in 1929: D 3685.⁹

Leo XIII in the *Encycl. “Satis cognitum”* says that “we see the Church passim in the sacred Scriptures described with the words of a perfect society” (ASS 28,724).

Pius XII in the *Encycl. “Mystici Corporis”* says: “The Church must be considered as a perfect society of its own kind.” The reason for this assertion is because “the divine Redeemer wanted the community of men founded by himself to be constituted as a perfect society of its own kind, and to be endowed with all the juridical and social elements necessary” (AAS 35,222.224).

In the revised draft of the *Constitution on the Church in Vatican Council I* in 1870: a) Cn.12: “If any one says that the power of governing in the Church is only directive, but not legislative, judicial and executive, let him be anathema.” b) Cn.13: “If any one says that the Church does not exist as a perfect society unfettered, but is subject to the civil power, let him be anathema.” The same teaching was contained in the first draft of the *Constitution on the Church*,” c.3 and 10, and also in cn.10 and 12.¹⁰

947. State of the question. We intend to prove what we say positively in the thesis. We are abstracting from the further question now raised among Catholics concerning the indirect power of the Church over the State.

948. Theological note. The thesis is *of Catholic faith*, because it is proposed by the universal ordinary Magisterium as a truth *to be held*.

8. Leo XIII: ASS 18 (1885) 165. See the *Encyclicals* of the same Supreme Pontiff: “*Diuturnum*”; ASS 14 (1881) 1-14; “*Immortale Dei*”; ASS 18 (1885) 161-180; “*Libertas*”; ASS 20 (1888) 593-613; “*Sapientiae christianae*”; ASS 22 (1890) 385-404; “*Rerum novarum*”; ASS 23 (1891) 641-670.

9. Pius XI, *Encycl. “Mortalium animos”*; AAS 20 (1928) 1-16.

10. *Vatican Council I, Constitutio de Ecclesia: Schema reformatum*: Msi 53,316s; *Schema primum*: Msi 51,540.543.552.

949. It is proved that: 1) the Church is a perfect society,

The Church has as her end the supernatural salvation of men and as the objective means the law of the Gospel, the doctrine of faith and morals and the divine mysteries, but as the subjective means the hierarchical powers of teaching, sanctifying and governing men.

But this end is the full and supreme good of men in their own order, while the means are fully in the power of the Church and they are entirely sufficient in order to obtain this end. Therefore the Church is a perfect society.

The conclusion is clear from the given definition of a perfect society.

The major has already been proved in the theses on the institution and end of the Church.

The minor. 1) The supernatural salvation of men is their full and supreme good, because no fuller or higher good can be given.

2) The means are fully in the power of the Church, because they were divinely conferred on the Church directly, immediately and exclusively: Matt. 16:18f.; 18:17f.; 28:18f.

3) These means to obtain the end are clearly sufficient, because they alone were instituted by God for the end of the Church and they are guaranteed by the divine assistance until the end of the world: Matt. 28:19; John 14:16f.26.

950. It is proved that: the Church is an absolutely independent society.

A. That society is *absolutely independent*, whose supreme authority, neither by reason of itself nor by reason of a higher end, is subject to some other social authority. But the supreme authority of the Church, neither by reason of itself nor by reason of a higher end, is subject to some other social authority. Therefore the Church is an absolutely independent society.

The major is clear from notion of an absolutely independent society.

The minor. The supreme authority of the Church is not subject to another social authority: a) *by reason of itself*, because it is of divine positive right, guaranteed by the assistance of God, hierarchical and universal: Matt. 16:18f.; 28:18f.; John 14:15f.; b) *nor by reason of its end*, because there is no social end higher than the end of the Church.

951. B. A society, which both *in its beginning* and *in its actual existence* is absolutely independent from civil society, also justly must be said to be absolutely independent. But the Church both in its beginning and in its actual existence is absolutely independent from civil society. Therefore also justly it must be said to be absolutely independent.

The major is clear, because the dependence of one moral person on another is founded on the fact that, either it was made by that other or it depends on it for its existence.

The minor. The Church is absolutely independent from civil society:

a) *in its beginning* 1) because it was divinely instituted totally independent of civil authority, as is certain from the theses on the institution of the Church and of the Primacy, and 2) because the Church has been propagated, according to the mandate of Christ, not only independently of, but also in opposition to the civil power: Matt. 10:17-28.

b) *in its actual existence* 1) because the Apostles de facto planted the Church in the midst of such opposition from the civil authority that eventually they became martyrs (see Acts 12:1-24; and also Acts 4:5-31; 5:17-42, where the opposition of the Jewish leaders is recorded); 2) because the successors of the Apostles defended the Church, in spite of the intense persecutions of the first three centuries; and 3) because from the 4th century the Father unceasingly defended the absolute independence of the Church against the interferences of the Emperors.¹¹

952. It is proved that: 3) the Church has legislative, judicial and executive power.

A. *Christ gave to the Apostles* for the Church the broad and supreme moral power of binding and loosing, which also is extended to judging and punishing offenders. But such power in a perfect society is a true legislative, judicial and executive power of jurisdiction. Therefore the Church has a true legislative, judicial and executive power of jurisdiction.

The minor is clear from the notions of a perfect society.

953. *The major.* 1) The proof is taken from Matt. 16:19; 18:16-18.¹²

a) That Christ gave moral power in the cited texts is certain from the theses on the promise of the Primacy and on the institution of the College of Apostles, where it was proved that in those places he is speaking about a true social power;

b) that this power was given for the Church is clear from the theses on the perpetuity of the Hierarchy and of the Primacy;

c) that it is very broad and supreme is expressed with the words "whatever you bind-loose" and "it will be bound-loosed in heaven": Matt. 16:19; 18:18;

11. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.79, where some famous testimonies of the Fathers, vindicating the independence of the Church, are quoted.

12. See I. Knabenbauer, *Comment. In Evang. Mt* 16,19; 18,16-18; see n.134ff.193f.

d) that it extends to judging and punishing the guilty is contained in the words "if he refused to listen to them (the witnesses), tell it to the Church" and "let him be to you as a Gentile and tax collector": Matt. 18:17.

954. *The major.* 2) *The confirmation* is taken from the praxis of the Apostles: 2 Thess. 3:4.6.14, where in verses 4 and 6 we have the exercise of legislative power, but in verse 14 judicial and executive powers are clearly supposed. Likewise in 1 Tim. 5:9-12 there is an exercise of legislative power, and in verses 19f. judicial and executive power. Also St. Paul is speaking about judicial and executive powers in 1 Cor. 4:19—5:13; 2 Cor. 13:1-3.10; and there is the exercise of legislative power in Acts 15:22-29; 16:4.

955. B) The legislative, judicial and executive power of jurisdiction of *the Church has always been acknowledged*, which she always claimed for herself and exercised over her own members. Therefore such power really belongs to the Church.

The antecedent is abundantly clear from the history of ecclesiastical legislation, beginning with the *Council of the Apostles* (Acts. 15:6f.) up to the *Code of Canon Law*, which was promulgated in 1917. Let it suffice to recall the *Lists, Bulls and Acts of the Roman Pontiffs*; the *Collected Acts of the Councils*, which were published by Mansi in 53 large volumes; the publications of the *Decretals* and of the canon laws, which are mentioned in the Preface to the *Code of Canon Law*. From these documents it is clearly proved that the Church fully exercised legislative, judicial and executive power, and that this power was always universally recognized.

The CIC [1917] treats the Church's *legislative power* in Books 1-3, canons 1-1551; her *judicial power* in Book 4, canons 1552-2194; and her *executive power* in Book 5, canons 2195-2414.

956. C. The Church is a perfect and independent society of men. But the legislative, judicial and executive power of jurisdiction necessarily belongs to a perfect and independent society of men. Therefore the Church has legislative, judicial and executive power.

Proof of the minor. Among men, as experience shows, a variety of talents is found—inconstancy of the will, and the heat of passions, which in a contrary way are opposed to the necessary cooperation of all so that the common end may be obtained efficaciously. Therefore, for a perfect and independent society a certain force or efficacious power is necessary in order to unite, strengthen and restrain the citizens so that all tend towards and obtain the common end. But this force that is suitable for men is nothing other than legislative, judicial and executive power. For, the *legislative* power unites the tendencies of all for the end, inasmuch as it proposes means suitable for the end that must be

used by all; but the *judicial* power strengthens all the inconstant, since is authoritatively resolves the doubts and conflicts of the citizens concerning the obligations of the laws; and finally, the *executive* power checks the heat of passions, inasmuch as with apt punishments it efficaciously deters all the citizens from transgressing the laws. Therefore, legislative, judicial and executive power of jurisdiction necessarily belongs to a perfect and independent society of men.

957. Objections.¹³ 1. An imperfect society is one that by reason of its end is part of another society. But the good of religion, which is the end of the Church, is part of the public welfare, which is the end of the State. Therefore the Church by reason of its end is an imperfect society.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. The good of religion is part of public welfare in the merely natural order, *conceded*; in the supernatural order, *denied*.

2. The supernatural order does not destroy but perfects the order of nature. But in the order of nature the good of religion is part of the public welfare. Therefore a fortiori in the supernatural order.

I distinguish the major. The supernatural order does not destroy the order of nature but perfects it so that also in many ways it positively modifies it, *conceded*; so that in no way does it positively modify it, *denied*. I concede the *minor* and *distinguish the consequent*. For in the matter we are considering, the natural order is modified in such a way that God has committed positively the good of supernatural religion to the care of a hierarchical power independent of the civil power.

958. 3. A perfect society is not one that lacks its own territory. But the Church lacks its own territory. Therefore the Church is not a perfect society.

I distinguish the major. A perfect society is not one that lacks its own territory in which it exercises its own special jurisdiction, *conceded*; which lacks its own territory in which it obtains civil dominion, *I subdistinguish*: it is not a natural or civil perfect society, *conceded*; supernatural and ecclesiastic, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.* For, the territory in which the Church can and must exercise with full right her hierarchical power and jurisdiction is the whole world, according to the command of Christ: *Go into the whole world...* (Mark 16:15); See Matt. 28:18; Acts 1:8.

959. 4. According to St. Optatus: "There is not a State in the Church, but the Church is in a State, that is, in the Roman Empire." But a society that is in a State is not independent from it. Therefore the Church is not independent from the State.

I admit the words of St. Optatus, but with regard to their meaning one must take into account the context: Donatus, he said, "was planning, contrary to the precepts of the Apostle Paul, to do injury to Kings and to those in high positions, for whom, if he had listened to the Apostle, he would have to pray daily; for this is what the blessed

13. See Pesch, *Compendium* t.1 n.236; Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.317.426.437; De Groot, *De Ecclesia* 136.394.400.404.410. See also J. Donat, *Ethica specialis* (1941) n.427-429.

Apostle Paul teaches: *Pray for kings and all who are in high positions, that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life (with them)* (1 Tim. 2:2). For, the State is not in the Church, but the Church is in the State, that is, in the Roman Empire,... where there are holy priests and chastity and virgins, which do not exist among barbarous nations, and, even if they were, they could not be safe."¹⁴

I distinguish the major. According to the context, St. Optatus wants to say—it is not the State which finds in the Church security and temporal goods, but on the contrary it is the Church which in the State, that is, in the Roman Empire, finds security and temporal goods, *conceded*; he wants to say that the Church is a part of the State and so depends on it, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*

960. 5. The Church needs temporal goods. But temporal goods are under the power of the State. Therefore the Church because of the means it needs is dependent on the State

I distinguish the major. The Church needs temporal goods either of a private nature or of the State, *conceded*; precisely the goods of the State, *I subdistinguish*: as the means absolutely necessary in order to obtain her supernatural end, *denied*; as suitable means so that the faithful may obtain the end of the Church, *I subdistinguish again*: and to such means the faithful have a right, as citizens of the State, and also the Church, as an association of citizens endowed with the legitimate right of possessing things, *conceded*; and to such means demanded by the State the faithful and the Church lack the right, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*

961. 6. Christ commanded: *Take no gold, nor silver, nor copper in your belts*: Matt. 10:9; see Mark 6:8; Luke 9:3; 10:4. Therefore: Christ positively forbids the possession of anything. Therefore the Church lacks all right of possessing anything.

I admit the text and explain: The warning of Christ refers only to the brief time of that previous mission of the Apostles, which he is speaking about in Matt. 10:5-15. It can also be taken as a pure counsel of perfection, about which he speaks in Luke 18:22; Matt. 19:21; Mark 10:21. For the Apostles possessed some things, as is certain from John 4:8; 16:6; Luke 22:35f.; 1 Cor. 9:14. That being the case, I respond to the objection.

I distinguish the antecedent. Christ positively forbade the Apostles to possess anything for a short space of time, *conceded*; for all and permanently, *I subdistinguish*: he recommended it by way of a counsel of perfection, *conceded*; he forbade it by way of a precept, *denied*.

962. 7. The Church cannot protect her own freedom from outside interference. Therefore she is not absolutely independent.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Church cannot protect her own freedom from persecutions, *conceded*; safely from a true dependence, *denied*.

8. Two perfect and independent societies over the same subjects are a perpetual source of discord. But the God of peace cannot be thought of as the source of discords.

14. St. Optatus Milevitanus, *De schismate Donati* 3,3: ML 11,999; edit. C. Ziwsa: CSEL 26,74.

Therefore God could not institute the Church as a perfect society independent from the State.

I distinguish the major. Two societies of the same order and power, *conceded*; of a diverse order and power, *I subdistinguish the major*: they are the sources of discord per se, *denied*; per accidens or because of the intellectual and moral deficiencies of men, *conceded*. *I concede the minor, distinguish the consequent in the same way and deny the consequence.*

Against the powers of the Church. 9. Christ openly rejected "the precepts of men." But the decrees of ecclesiastical legislative power are the precepts of men. Therefore Christ openly rejected "the precepts of men which make void the commandments of God": Matt. 15:9; Mark 7:7-13, *conceded*; which are in accord with the divine law, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor, and I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

963. 10. As in the O.T. there was a command not to add anything to the Law: Deut. 4:2; 12:32; so also in the N.T., through the mouth of Paul there is a command "to guard the good deposit": 1 Tim. 6:20; 2 Tim. 1:14. Therefore the power of establishing laws is excluded after those that the Church received from the Apostles.

I concede the antecedent and distinguish the consequent. In both Testaments the power of making laws contrary to or less in agreement with the divine law is excluded, *conceded*; laws in agreement with the divine law and which help obtain a better observance of that law, *denied*. And because of this distinction *the consequence is denied*.

964. 11. External things are the object of legislative power. But external things are not under the power of the Church. Therefore there is no legislative power in the Church.

I bypass the major because it pertains to the treatise *On Law* to determine the cases, if there are any, in which the Church can prescribe or prohibit internal acts. *I distinguish the minor.* Things which have no connection with the matters of faith, worship and morals, *conceded*; which have a true connection with matters of faith, worship and morals, *denied*. For, such things are the profession and propagation of the faith, liturgical worship with sacrifice and the sacraments, the morals of the faithful, etc.

12. James 4:12 says: *There is one lawgiver and judge.* Therefore legislative and judicial powers are excluded from the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Absolutely, principally and on his own right Christ is the one lawgiver and judge, *conceded*; relatively, ministerially and with a vicarious right, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent and the consequence is denied*.

965. 13. In Matt. 18:15-18 the Lord is speaking about fraternal correction. Therefore from that text the judicial power of the Church cannot be proved.

I distinguish the antecedent. He is speaking about fraternal correction in verses 15 and following, but in the same place judicial power is also mentioned in v. 17 and following, *conceded*; he is speaking only about fraternal correction, *denied*.

14. The same text of Matt. 18:15-18 is dealing with a particular Church of some

place. Therefore he is not speaking about the judicial power of the universal Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Verses 15f. are dealing with a particular Church, *conceded*; verses 17f. are dealing with a particular Church in which the broad and supreme power of binding and loosing is expressed, *I subdistinguish*: they are dealing with a particular Church simply and primarily, *denied*; in a certain respect and secondarily, *again I subdistinguish*: they are dealing with a particular Church as a partaker in the power which is asserted for the universal Church in v.18, *conceded*; with a particular Church without any concern for the power said to belong to the universal Church, *denied*.

966. 15. The Christian law is not a law of fear, but of love. But the executive or coercive power moves not with love but with fear. Therefore coercive power is not Christian.

I distinguish the major. In the stage of consummation in heaven where men are no longer defective, *conceded*; in the stage of probation on earth where men are attracted to immoral enticements, *I subdistinguish*: the Christian law is a law of love positively, principally and primarily, *conceded*; exclusively and secondarily, *denied*. For, a holy fear of the justice of God is very healthy in this life.

16. The purpose of the coercive power of the Church is to correct unwilling delinquents with punishments so that they serve God voluntarily. But punishment corrects no unwilling persons so that they serve God voluntarily. Therefore the coercive power of the Church is useless.

I distinguish the major. This is the purpose of punishments as an example for others, *denied*; as medicinal, *I subdistinguish*: to be obtained at least indirectly and partially, *conceded*; to be obtained precisely directly and immediately, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor; the consequent and the consequence are denied.*

967. 17. The goal of the coercive power of the Church is at least to deter its subjects from iniquity. But often it is entirely certain that obstinate and hardened persons are not deterred from iniquity by any punishments. Therefore at least regarding these the Church lacks coercive power.

I distinguish the major. Either in a medicinal way to coerce delinquent subjects to have a change of heart or to make an example of them so that others are not delinquent, *conceded*; to coerce only delinquent subjects, *denied*. *I concede the minor, distinguish the consequent and deny the consequence.*

18. His disciples James and John said: Lord, do you want us to bid fire come down from heaven and consume them? But he turned and rebuked them, saying: You do not know what manner of spirit you are of; for the Son of man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them. With these words Christ taught that corporal punishments are contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. Therefore the Church lacks coercive power, at least to inflict corporal punishments.

I distinguish the antecedent. It is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel to inflict punishments on those who are not yet members of the Church, *conceded*; on the members of the Church, *I subdistinguish*: immoderate or inopportune and useless punishments,

conceded; moderate or opportune or useful, denied. I also distinguish the consequent and the consequence is denied.

968. 19. St. Ambrose said: "My tears are weapons. For such defenses belong to the priest. I must not and I cannot resist in any other way." And St. John Chrysostom said: "It is permitted for Christians in no way to correct the faults of sinners with force."¹⁵ Therefore: the holy Fathers either deny to the Church or declare illicit the power of inflicting corporal punishments. Therefore such power should not be attributed to the Church.

I will explain the quoted texts: St. Ambrose says that he must not and cannot use military force to resist Auxentius, who with his armies had unjustly taken over property of the Church; St. Chrysostom teaches that sick souls cannot be healed by force alone, but rather by the voluntary taking of spiritual medicine. This having been said, I now respond.

I distinguish the antecedent. The holy Fathers deny to the Church the power of inflicting corporal punishments regarding the non-baptized, or to force the conversion of the faithful or to procure merely earthly goods; for they say that this is illicit for the Church, if the punishments are immoderate or inopportune or clearly useless, *conceded; otherwise, denied.*

969. 20. Anyone who lacks material power cannot exact corporal punishments. But the Church lacks material power. Therefore the Church cannot exact corporal punishments.

I distinguish the major. By herself, *conceded; through the help of others, denied. I concede the minor and distinguish the consequent in the same way; the consequence is denied.*

21. To obtain the end of the Church, moral and spiritual punishments are more effective than corporal. Therefore corporal punishments are not necessary.

I distinguish the antecedent. For the most part and often, *conceded; in all cases and always, denied. Similarly I distinguish the consequent and the consequence is denied.*

970. 22. The power of imposing corporal punishments is inhuman and leads to harsh cruelty. Therefore it should be said that it is harmful to the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Per se and by its very nature, *denied; per accidens and depending on circumstances, I subdistinguish: it is inhuman and leads to cruelty because of the blameworthy abuse of men, conceded; by its fair and legitimate use, denied.*

Concerning the inhumanity which the Church is often accused of because of the abuses of the tribunal of the *Inquisition*, a careful distinction should be made between true abuses, and the many fictional ones which the enemies of the Church have fabricated. Concerning true abuses, a distinction should be made between those for which

15. St. Ambrose, *Sermo contra Auxentium* n.2: ML 16,1050; St. John Chrysostom, *De Sacerdotio* l.2 n.3: MG 48,634.

the ecclesiastical tribunal was responsible and those for which the tribunal as a civil body was responsible. If an accurate distinction is made in these matters, the justice of the Church also in the tribunal of the Inquisition easily can be shown to have been free from the crime of inhumanity and cruelty.¹⁶

971. 23. The coercive power of a perfect society includes the right of inflicting capital punishment. But the Church lacks this right. Therefore she also lacks coercive power.

A twofold response: Firstly, with those who deny to the Church the right of imposing capital punishment: I distinguish the major. In a society whose end is temporal prosperity, *conceded*; in a society whose end is eternal salvation, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; the consequent and consequence are denied.*

Secondly, I respond with those who concede to the Church the right to impose capital punishment: I distinguish the major. The coercive power of a perfect society includes the right of imposing capital punishment, however to be decided and put into execution at least by the function of those who have the power, *conceded*; to be decided and put into execution immediately by herself, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* The Church by law cannot decree and inflict capital punishment immediately by herself, *conceded*; through the assistance of the secular arm which has the power, *denied*.¹⁷

16. B. Llorca, *historia eclesiástica* § 117 and 139; J. Guiraud, *Inquisition*: DAFC 2,823-890; E. Vacandard, *Inquisition*: DTC 7,2016-2068.

17. See Ioan. Muncunill and the authors whom he cites in *De Ecclesia* n.442.

CHAPTER II

On the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church,
and on her members.

ARTICLE I

THE CHURCH IS THE MYSTICAL BODY OF CHRIST

Thesis 24. The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ the Head, whose quasi-soul is the Holy Spirit; hence rightly it is called the House of the children of God.

972. Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis Christi"*: AAS 35 (1943) 193-248; S. Th. III, q. 81; 3, d.13 q.2 a.2; *De ver.* q.29 a.2-4 and 5; Toletus, *In* 3 q.8; Suarez, *In* 3 q.8; D. Petavius, *De Incarnatione* 1.12 c.17; H. Hurter, *De Ecclesia Corpore Christi Mystico: SS.Patrum Opuscula* t.27; I.B. Franzelin, th.18; D. Palmieri, *Prolog. De Ecclesia* th.11; G. Wilmers, th.14-19; A. Straub, th.10; Ae. Dorsch, th.25f.; M. D'Herbigny, th.7 and 30; I. Muncunill, n.105-112; H. Dieckmann, n.925-948; L. Lercher, t.1 n.383-396; t.4 n.1-48; S. Tromp, *Litterae Encyclicae de Mystico Iesus Christi Corpore: Textus et Documenta* Ser.theol. 26 (1943); Id., *De Spiritu Sancto anima Corporis Mystici, Testimonia selecta e Patribus graecis et latinis: Textus et Documenta* Ser.theol. 1 and 7 (19320; Id., *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (1946); E. Meersch, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ: Etudes de théologie historique* 2 v. (1944). From Commentaries on the teaching of St. Paul: F. Prat, *La théologie de S.Paul* 1 (1934) 359-370; 2 (1933) 341-362; W. Koester, *Die Idee der Kirche beim Apostel Paulus* (1928) 22-63; A. Wikenhauser, *Die Kirche als die mystische Leib Christi nach dem Apostel Paulus* (19400; L. Cerfaux, *La Théol. De l'Eglise s. S.Paul* (1942); J.M. Bover, *Teologia de San Pablo* (1946) 1.7 c.4; W. Goossens, *L'Eglise Corps du Christ d'après St. Paul* (1949); T. Soiron, *Die Kirche als der Leib Christi* (1951). The following authors wrote monographs on the Mystical Body of Christ in various vernacular languages: H. Lang (1929); J. Anger (1934); C. Feckes (1934); F. Sheen (1935); E. Mura (1936); D. Haugg (1937); F. Jürgenmeier (1938); L. Deimel (1940); M. Teixeira-Leite (1944); F. Grivec (1944). There are also special treatises: E. Elorduy, *El Cuerpo místico de Cristo en Suarez.*: RevEspT 3 (1943) 347.397.443-474; A.M. Landgraf, *Die Lehre vom geheimnisvollen Leib Christi in den frühen Paulinenkommentaren und in der Frühscholastik*: DivThom (Fr) 24 (1946) 217-248, 393-428; 25 (1947) 365-436; 26 (1948) 160-180, 291-323, 395-434; F. Grivec, *Skrivnosmo telo Jezusa Kristus-Okroznica PP.Pija XII* (1944); K. Rahner, *Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach der Lehre der Encyklica Pius XII "Mystici Corporis"*: ZkathTh 69 (1947) 129-188; C. Feckes, *Die Kirche als Herrenleib: Darlegungen zur Encyk "Mystici Corporis"* (1949); A. Mitterer, *Geheimnisvoller Leib Christi nach St. Thomas und nach Pius XII* (1950); H. de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum* (1949); E. Sauras, *El Cuerpo místico de Cristgo* (1952); M. Meinertz, *Theol. des N.T.* 2 p.155-184; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) 331-597.

973. **Connection.** We have proved that the end of the Church is the supernatural sanctification and salvation of men, which ultimately consists in union with God. Now we want to inquire further into the nature of this union with the Triune God, which takes place in the Church by incorporation and regeneration through Baptism "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (Matt. 28:19); for from that the supernatural character of the Church can be more fully known.

974. Definition of terms. The *Church* is the militant supernatural society instituted by Christ on earth, which we have treated up to this point. Therefore we are not considering the Church suffering in purgatory and triumphant in heaven.

Body is understood, in comparison with the human body, as something visible and one, and coalescing out of various organs. Clearly this is a *metaphorical* denomination, but this metaphor was inspired by the Holy Spirit in the Scriptures and given its full meaning.

The body of men can be spoken about in three ways: A *physical body* is that whose various members subsist with the subsistence, not of the individual members, but of the whole organism belonging to a body: in this way the body of Christ exists in heaven and in the Eucharist. A *moral body* is that whose unity of the members comes only from outside, namely, from one definite end and from the common cooperation to achieve that same end. A *mystical body* surely is not physical, but moral, but its unity regarding the definite end is perfected further by an internal supernatural principle, which really infuses a life full of mysteries into all the members of the body.

Let us listen to Pius XII: "That the Church is a body we find asserted again and again in the Sacred Scriptures (Col. 1:18). Now if the Church is a body it must be something one and undivided...and it must also be something concrete and visible (Leo XIII: ASS 28,710)... But a body requires a number of members so connected that they help one another...Moreover, just as in nature a body does not consist of an indiscriminate heap of members, but must be provided with organs, that is, the members not having the same function yet properly coordinated, so the Church for this special reason merits to be called a body, because it results from a suitable disposition and coherent union of parts and is provided with members different from one another but harmoniously compacted" (Rom. 12:4).

"The word *mystical* serves to distinguish the social body of the Church, of which Christ is the Head and ruler, from his physical Body which, born of the Virgin Mother of God, is now seated at the right hand of the Father... Furthermore, and this is of great importance because of modern errors, we are enabled thereby to differentiate it from any body of the natural order, whether physical or moral. Whereas in a physical body the principle of unity joins the parts together in such a way that each of them completely lacks a subsistence of its own, on the contrary in the *mystical* Body the cohesive force, intimate though it is, unites the members with one another in such a way that each of them wholly retains his own personality... Comparing now the *mystical* Body with a *moral* body, we must notice also between these a difference which is by no means slight but, on the contrary, of the very highest moment. For in a *moral* body the only principle of unity is a common end, and a common aspiration of all to that end by means of the social authority. But in the *mystical* Body, with which we are concerned, there is in addi-

tion to his common aspiration another internal principle ..., namely the divine Spirit."¹

975. Christ is said to be the *Head of the Mystical Body*, because in relation to the body of the Church Christ controls those parts, which the head of a man controls in relation to his own natural body: that is, he influences its movement internally and externally he governs all the acts of the body.²

The Church is said to be the *Body of Christ* especially because Christ is its Founder and Head, and consequently also because he is the sustainer and Savior of the Church.

976. *The Holy Spirit* is understood in the thesis as the third Person of the Most Holy Trinity. The *human soul* is the first and radical principle of the unity and life of the human body. It is distinguished from the powers, which are the proximate principles by which the soul operates, and from the effects which the soul and its powers produce. In the Mystical Body of Christ the powers and vital effects can be said to be sanctifying grace, the habits of virtue and the other supernatural gifts.

The Holy Spirit is called the *quasi-soul*, because in the Mystical Body of Christ he cannot properly be called the soul, since the Holy Spirit cannot be united substantially with the Mystical Body; but he is called the soul *analogically*, because of the likeness to the soul of a human body, namely, inasmuch as the Holy Spirit *effectively* and *quasi-formally* in the Church produces the effects of life similar to those which the soul of a man produces in a human body.

977. The words of the thesis *hence rightly* indicate that the third part is deduced from the two preceding parts as a conclusion.

House is understood in the sense, not of the material building, but in the formal sense, that is, *like a family*, according to the saying of the Lord: *I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel* (Matt. 15:24), and to the words in Luke: *because he was of the house and lineage of David* (2:4).

The children of God are understood to be those who have obtained adopted divine sonship at least through the regeneration of Baptism (John 1:12.13; 3:5).

978. State of the question. The thesis, from the way in which it is worded, has three parts and by those three parts the relations of unity of the

1. See Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis"*: AAS 35,199f.221f.

2. See S.Th. III, q. 8, a. 6.

members of the Church to the individual divine Persons are manifested. For, the members of the Church in this Mystical Body are united: a) *with Christ the Son of God*, as members to the Head; b) *with the Holy Spirit*, as a body to its soul; c) *with God the Father*, as children to their Father.

979. Adversaries. The main ones are mentioned by Pius XII in his *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis."* 1) The *Schismatic Orientals* are listed, who so stress that Christ is the one Head of the Church that they exclude a Vicar of Christ on earth.

Listen to Pius XII: "It is a well-known fact that Christ the Lord... entrusted to the Prince of the Apostles the visible government of the whole society which he had founded... And it cannot be validly objected that by the establishment of a primacy of jurisdiction in the Church this Mystical Body was given two heads. For in virtue of the Primacy Peter is none other than the Vicar of Christ, and therefore this Body has only one principal Head, namely, Christ" (AAS 35,210f.)³

2) *Protestants*, who indeed retain faith in Christ, but defend three classes of errors: a) some say that there is no Mystical Body of Christ and no visible Church, but an invisible Church, whether, like the Lutherans, they define it as the congregation of the justified, or, like the Calvinists, they call it the congregation of the predestined; b) others completely separating the juridical Church from the charismatic, hold that only the charismatic Church was founded by Christ, and therefore only it can be called the Mystical Body of Christ; c) still others adhering to the three branch theory of the Church or to other similar theories, destroy the real unity and organic uniqueness of the Mystical Body.

Pius XII wrote concerning this: "Everything that We have so far explained shows what a grave error it is arbitrarily to imagine the Church as something interior and invisible, or to set her on the same level with any human institution having disciplinary government and external rites, but having no communication of supernatural life... We therefore deplore and condemn also the calamitous error which invents an imaginary Church, a society nurtured and shaped by charity, with which it disparagingly contrasts another society which it calls juridical." Previously he had written: "It is an aberration from divine truth to represent the Church as something intangible and invisible, as a mere "pneumatic" entity joining together by an invisible link a number of communities of Christians in spite of their difference in faith" (AAS 35,223f. and 199f.).⁴

3. See M. Jugie, 4. *De Ecclesia* 414; S. Zankow, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum* (1928) 68. S.Th., *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum* c.4: Edit. Vivès, t.29, p.34.

4. See Pius XI, *Encycl. "Mortalium animos."* There he treats the reason by which the union of the Churches can be obtained: AAS 20 (1928) 1-16. Pius XII, *Sermon*: "It is a big mistake to separate the juridical Church from the Church of charity; but that Church rightly founded, whose head is the Pontiff, is the same as the Church of Christ, the Church of charity, and the universal Family of Christians" (AAS 31 [1939] 250; see 248); see J.M. Alonso, *Juridismo y Caridad*: XII SemEspañ de Teología (1953) 451-541; J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el Misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 207-273.

980. 3) Our whole thesis is also denied by: a) *Rationalists* because they think it is utterly absurd that anything can surpass and transcend the powers of human genius; b) *Naturalists* who want to see in the Church of Christ nothing other than merely juridical and social bonds; c) *Evolutionists* who say that the doctrine of the Mystical Body was invented by St. Paul; they say it was borrowed by the Hellenistic philosophers and Gnostics and then adapted to the needs of the primitive Church.

Pius XII said: "On the one hand the error of *Rationalism* persists, rejecting as absurd anything which transcends the powers of the human mind, side by side with the kindred false doctrine of *Naturalism* which in the Church of Christ sees nothing, and refuses to see anything, apart from purely juridical and social ties. On the other hand, there is the insidious growth of a false *Mysticism*, which attempts to obliterate the inviolable frontiers between things created and their Creator" (AAS 35,197).⁵

981. 4) Among Catholics certainly those err: a) who defend a certain exaggerated *mysticism*, "and fail to appreciate sufficiently that the Apostle Paul spoke metaphorically on this matter, since according to them the divine Redeemer and the members of the Church are united to form one physical person";

b) who introduce an unsound *quietism*, "by attributing the whole spiritual life of Christians and their advance towards virtue solely to the action of the divine Spirit, to the exclusion and neglect of the cooperation which we must provide";

c) who, relying on a false notion of the *liturgy*, then contend "that the frequent confession of venial sins is not a practice to be greatly esteemed, and that preference is to be given to that general confession which the Bride of Christ, together with her children united to her in the Lord, makes daily through the priests who are about to go up to the altar of God," or they try to insinuate that "the private prayers to God are to be accounted of little value, inasmuch as it is rather the public prayers offered in the name of the Church which have real worth, since they proceed from the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ," or they say that our prayers "ought not to be addressed to the Person of Jesus Christ himself, but rather to God, or through Christ to the eternal Father, on the ground that our Savior in his capacity of Head of his Mystical Body is to be regarded only as *the Mediator of God and men* (1 Tim. 2:5)" (AAS 35,234-236).⁶

982. Doctrine of the Church. *The first part*, where we say that the Church is a Body whose Head is Christ, is taught by Boniface VIII in the Bull "*Unam Sanctam*," where it is also said that by Christ the Head the Vicar of Christ is not excluded from the Mystical Body (D 870-872). In addition there is the doctrine of the *Council of Trent*, sess.13 on the Eucharist, where this first part is taught (D 1638).

And it is taught in the catechism of the same *Council*: "There is one ruler and governor of the Church, of course invisible, Christ, whom the eternal Father gave as head

5. See F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 67ff.

6. Because of false mysticism, the book of C. Pelz was forbidden by the Holy Office, *Der Christ als Christus*: AAS 32 (1940) 502; for his submission, see AAS 33 (1941) 24. Against *Quietism*, see Pius XII, *Allocutione*: AAS 33 (1941) 498-501.

over all the Church, which is his body" (Eph. 1:22). Because of this "the Body is joined together with its Holy Head, Christ the Lord, the fount of all holiness" (p.1 a.9 n.11.13).

983. Leo XIII expressly taught the *second part* in the *Encycl.* "*Divinum illud munus*" where he said: "The Divine Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Word in the eternal light of sanctity, himself both love and gift... poured all his fullness upon Christ and upon his Mystical Body, the Church." "That the Church is a divine institution is most clearly proved by the splendor and glory of those gifts and graces with which she is adorned, and whose author and giver is the Holy Spirit. Let it suffice to state that, as Christ is the Head of the Church, *so is the Holy Spirit her soul*. What the soul is to our body, that is the Holy Spirit in Christ's Body, the Church."⁷

And already in the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*: "It is one and the same Spirit who imparts grace to the faithful just as the soul confers life to the members of the body... For just as the human body consists of many members, and they are nourished by one soul, which supplies sight to the eyes, hearing to the ears and different power to the other senses; so also the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, is composed out of many faithful Christians" (p.1 a.9 n.12).

984. Pius XI teaches the *third part* in the *Encycl.* "*Divini illius Magistri*": "The Church, we say, that great family of Christ" (D 2217 [34th ed.]. But in the Liturgy the Church is called "the family of God" in the *Canon*: "We beseech Thee graciously to accept this oblation of our service and that of Thy whole family," and in the orations of the Divine Office for the First Sunday of Lent, for Passion Sunday, etc. In the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* the doctrine of the two first parts is taught; but concerning the third part it says: "The Church is therefore called a house, because she is like a family, which is governed by one Father." Pius XII: "the Church is the universal Family of Christians."⁸

985. Pius XII, "We have deemed it Our pastoral duty to set forth to the whole Christian flock the doctrine of the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ and the union of the faithful with the divine Redeemer therein," by means of this *Encyclical Letter* "*Mystici Corporis Christi*" (AAS 35,198.237). Therefore this *Encyclical* must really be called dogmatic, and in it he deals especially with Church as it exists on earth, namely, "by developing and explaining those aspects of it which concern the Church *militant*" (*loc.cit.*, 193).

See especially how clearly in it is proposed:

1) That the Church truly is a *Body* (*loc.cit.* 199f.; see above n.974);

2) That the Church is *the Body of Christ*: "We have seen," he said, "that the Church is so constituted that it may be likened to a body. We have now to explain clearly and carefully the reasons for which it is to be called, not merely a body, but *the Body of Jesus Christ*. This becomes plain from the fact that of this Mystical Body our Lord is the

7. Leo XIII, *Encycl.* "*Divinum illud munus*": ASS 29 (1897) 650.674.

8. Pius XII, see note 4. *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, edit. Desclée (1890), part 1, De Symbolo fidei, a.9, Credo sanctam Ecclesiam catholicam, n.4.11.12.13.

Founder, the Head, the Upholder, and the Savior" (*loc.cit.* 204). Each one of these points he explain at length (*loc.cit.* 204-221).

3) That the Body of the Church is "*Mystical*" he explains further (*loc.cit.* 221-225); we presented the principle ones in n.974, and they will become more clear from what he teaches about the Soul of the Church.

4) He says carefully that Christ is *the Head of the Mystical Body*: "That this Mystical Body," he says, "which is the Church, is designated with the name of Christ is clear from the fact that He is considered by all really to be its Head (Col 1:18; 2:19; Eph. 4:16)." Then he proves that Christ is the Head of the Church, a) by reason of his *pre-eminence*, b) because *He rules the Church*, c) because Christ and his Body *need each other*, d) by reason of the *likeness* between Christ and his members, e) by reason of his *fullness*, f) by reason of his *dynamic influence* (*loc. cit.* 208-216). In particular, because *He rules the Church*: "The exalted place which Christ holds," he says, "gives him the right to be the sole rule of the Church; and for this reason also he is likened to the Head. The head is the royal citadel of the body, and because it is endowed with more perfect gifts it naturally rules all the members, being purposely placed above them to have them under its care. In like manner the divine Redeemer wields the supreme power and government over the whole commonwealth of Christians" (*loc.cit.* 209). *By reason of his dynamic influence*: "The last reason shows in a particular way that Christ is the Head of his Mystical Body. For, as the nerves are diffused from the head to all the members of our body, giving them the power to feel and move, so our Savior pours forth into the Church his power and virtue... From Him flows into the Body of the Church all the light which divinely illumines those who believe, and all the grace which makes them holy as He himself is holy... It is He himself who chooses, determines, and distributes graces to each *according to the measure of the giving of Christ* (Eph. 4:7). It is thus that, deriving its power from the divine Redeemer, its head and source, *the whole body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love*" (Eph. 4:16; Col. 2:19) (*loc.cit.* 215ff).

5) He teaches that the Holy Spirit is the *soul of the Mystical Body* with these words: "This divine principle of life and power given to the Church by Christ... is nothing other than the Paraclete, the Spirit... This Spirit of Christ is the invisible principle to which we must also attribute the union of all the parts of the Body with one another and with their exalted Head, dwelling as he does whole in the Head, whole in the Body, and whole in each of its members... He, with his heavenly breath of life, is the source from which proceeds every single vital and effectively salutary action in all the parts of the Body." Hence he concludes with Leo XIII: "It is enough to state that, since Christ is the Head of the Church, the Holy Spirit is her soul" (*loc.cit.* 218-220; see n.983): D 3812.

6) That the faithful united together in the Mystical Body constitute *the Family of God* can be inferred from the teaching of Pius XII; according to it the faithful are said to be "brothers according to the flesh become children of the only-begotten God," "partakers of the divine nature," "and conformed to the image of the Son of God," by which truly "they become the children of God" (*loc.cit.* 198.214).

986. Theological note. Therefore the thesis, as to all three parts, is *Catholic doctrine*, from the universal Magisterium of the Supreme Pontiffs in the *Encyclicals* we have cited. It can also be said to be *of divine faith*, because it is contained directly in Holy Scripture.

987. Proof. Part 1. It is openly taught by St. Paul that **the Church is the Body of Christ** in 1 Cor. 12:4-30: a) The manifest and visible diversity of gifts, ministries and operations is not opposed to the unity of the Body, because all of these proceed from the one Triune God (1 Cor. 12:4-11); the Body of the Church is composed of diverse and various organs in a likeness to the human body (1 Cor. 12:14-26); c) Therefore the Church is the Body of Christ, similar to the human body (1 Cor. 12:12f.27). Aptly St. Thomas says (on 1 Cor. 12:12): "When he says *so it is with Christ*, an adaptation of the similitude is being used, by saying: *So it is with Christ*, that is, it is one, according to what he had said: *One Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things* (1 Cor. 8:6). And still it has many and diverse members, namely, all the faithful, according to this: *We, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another* (Rom. 12:5)."

On those words: *So it is with Christ* and *you are the body of Christ*, consult St. John Chrysostom, who said: "He added, *so it is with Christ*: And when he could have said, *so it is with the Church*, for that was the logical conclusion: in fact he did not say that, but in its place he put Christ, raising his prayer on high... But this is meant to signify: *So it is with the body of Christ which is the Church*. For just as both the body and the head are one man, so also he said that the Church and Christ are one; therefore he put Christ for the Church." You can add to this from *the ordinary Gloss*: "The Head, he said, and the body are called Christ, because of the ineffable union of Head and members." See also what St. Augustine said: "The whole Christ is the Head and Body. The only-begotten Son of God is the Head, and the Church is his Body, bridegroom and bride, two in one flesh."⁹

Hence from this place St. Paul clearly says that the Church is the Body of Christ, that is, something visible and one, but coalescing out of various organs, and pertaining to Christ; surely this must be understood as a likeness to the human body, as the Apostle himself says.

988. 2) The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ: that is, a moral body, but one whose moral unity is perfected further and elevated by an internal supernatural principle. This can be shown from the quoted

9. St. John Chrysostom, *In 1 Cor* 12:12, hom.30: MG 61,250; Walafridi Strabonis (+ 840) *Glossa Ordinaria*: ML 114,541; St. Augustine, *Epist. Contra Donatistas* (De unitate Ecclesiae) c.4 n.7: ML 43,395. See at this place, R. Cornely, *Comment.*: L. Cerfaux, *loc.cit.*, n.972 p.206.

testimony of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 12:4-11. But it can also be proved from Eph. 4:1-8: a) There St. Paul speaks about moral union and about the virtues which contribute very much to it (Eph. 4:1-3); b) Then the holy Apostle goes on to say that there is an internal and supernatural principle perfecting that moral union (Eph. 4:4-8). Consult St. Augustine on this place, where he says: "The body is composed of many members, and one Spirit nourishes all the members... The functions of the members are different, but Spirit animates all of them."¹⁰

989. 3) Christ is the Head of the Mystical Body, from which vital powers flow forth and by which the members of the Church are united and their operations are regulated. a) That Christ is the Head is inferred from Eph. 1:22f., where it is said that Christ was constituted by God the Father over all as the Head of the Church; but the Church is said to be the fullness (πλήρωμα), which can be understood in two ways; either *actively*, that is, the Church is that which completes Christ, namely, since she presents members to him as its Head; or *passively*, that is, the Church is that which is completed by Christ, namely, by the life and gifts which come to the members from him as its Head. It is necessary here to check the Greek text.¹¹ The assertion about Christ as the Head appears also in Col. 1:18-20.

b) That the vital powers are derived from Christ, by which the members of the Church are united and their operations are regulated is deduced expressly from Eph. 4:15-16, and also from Col. 1:19, as is explained by Pius XII in the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis"* (AAS 35,217; n.985,4).

c) The same point can be confirmed from John 15:1-5; in order to understand this passage consult Pius XII, "*Mystici Corporis*," and other declarations of the ecclesiastical Magisterium concerning the same text (*loc.cit.* 216; D 227, 244, 245, 377, 394, 399-400, 1545-1547), and also St. Augustine: "That is the place in the Gospel where the Lord says that he is the vine and the disciples are the branches; accordingly he says that he is the Head of the Church and we are his members—the Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."¹²

990. 4) The Church is the Body of Christ and it is such in the full sense, because as a reality Pius XII (AAS 35,204-221) says that Christ is

10. St. Augustine, *In epist. ad Eph* 4,4, sermon 268 n.2: ML 38,1232; St. Jerome, *In epist. ad Eph* 1.2 c.4 v.4: ML 26,494f.: "But when he says this: *One body and one Spirit*, only the one body of Christ is understood, which is the Church... and one Holy Spirit; for he is the one benefactor and sanctifier of all."

11. See I. Knabenbauer, *Comment. In epist. ad Eph* 1,22f. Pius XII, "*Mystici Corporis*" p.230.

12. St. Augustine, *In Ioan. Tract.* 80,1; John 15:1-3: ML 35,1839.

“the Founder, the Head, the Upholder and the Savior of this Mystical Body.” This can also be deduced from what has been proved, but it is contained openly in St. Paul, Eph. 5:23-30: “Christ is the head of the Church: He is the *Savior* of his body... Christ loved the Church and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, that he might present the Church to himself in splendor..., which he nourishes and cherishes.”

Furthermore, the Church is called *the Body of Christ*, because, as Pius XII points out, “the divine Redeemer with his social Body constitutes as it were a mystical person.” But the Pontiff confirming this with the authority of Bellarmine, says: “This naming of the Body of Christ is not to be explained only from the fact that Christ must be said to be the Head of his Mystical Body; it means also that He so upholds the Church and so, after a certain manner, lives in the Church that she may be said to be another Christ.” This doctrine was taught by St. Augustine: “Christ speaks, because Christ is in the members of Christ... And as you know, because Christ is said to be one Head and one Body, he himself says when he speaks about marriage: *The two shall be in one flesh* (Matt. 19:5). Therefore as from two there will be one person, composed of Head and Body, from bridegroom and bride... Therefore let Christ speak, because in Christ the Church speaks and in the Church Christ speaks, and the Body in the Head and the Head in the Body.” On this point St. Gregory said: “Our Redeemer showed himself as one person with his Church, which he assumed (Eph. 4:15; Col. 1:24). We have already often said that Christ and the Church are one person; namely, that he is the Head of this Body, but that the Church is the Body of this Head. Therefore we believe that Christ and the Church are one person.” Finally, St. Thomas said: “The whole Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ, is thought of as one person with its own Head, which is Christ.”¹³

Thus unity of person, which must be understood not as physical but as mystical according to the words of Pius XII (AAS 35,218), is derived from the word with which the Lord rebuked the persecutor of the Church when he said: “*Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me?* (Acts 9:4); and also from St. Paul when, by adding nothing else, he calls the Church “Christ” (1 Cor. 12:12) and, when writing to the Galatians according to the original Greek, he says: “For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ... for you are all one in Christ Jesus.”

13. St. Augustine, *Enar. In Ps 30*, serm.1, n.4; see *Enar. In Ps 56*, n.1 and 127, n.3: ML 36,232.662 and 37,1679. St. Gregory the Great, *Moral. Praef.*, c.6 n.14; 1.19 c.14 n.2; 1.23 c.1 n.21; 1.35 c.14 n.24; *In septem Ps. Paenit.* Ps 101,1: ML 75,525; 76,110,251,762; 79,602. S.Th. III, q. 49, a. 1. See Jourmet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, 2 (1951) 126-135.

991. Part 2. The Holy Spirit is the quasi-Soul of the Mystical Body of Christ.

The human soul related to the body of man is: 1) its informing principle; 2) its principle of unity and activity; 3) its vital principle. But related to the Mystical Body of Christ the Holy Spirit is 1) quasi-informing principle, 2) its quasi-principle of unity and activity, 3) its quasi-vital principle. Therefore the Holy Spirit is the quasi-Soul of the Mystical Body of Christ.

Proof of the minor. 1) *The Holy Spirit is the quasi-informing principle of the Mystical Body of Christ.* For, the human soul, as the informing principle, is a spiritual substance, existing definitively in the body, but intrinsically independent of it both in being and in operation, and elevating the human body to the order of living with a rational life. But the Holy Spirit is a spiritual substance, existing quasi-definitively in the Mystical Body of Christ, but absolutely independent of it both in being and in operation, and elevating the Mystical Body to the order of living with a supernatural life. Therefore the Holy Spirit is the quasi-informing principle of the Mystical Body of Christ.

The major is clear from Psychology.

The minor. a) That the Holy Spirit is a spiritual substance and absolutely independent of the Mystical Body both in being and in operation is certain because he is a spirit and pure act.

b) That the Holy Spirit exists quasi-definitively in the Mystical Body of Christ can be deduced from St. Paul; for in 1 Cor. 3:9.16.17 the Apostle teaches that the Holy Spirit exists as in his own temple in the whole body of the Church; and the same Apostle in 1 Cor. 6:15.19 shows that the Holy Spirit exists also completely in individual members of the Church. Therefore St. Paul teaches us that the Holy Spirit is in the Church as whole in the whole and whole in each of its parts, that is, in a definitive way.

c) That the Holy Spirit elevates the Mystical Body to the order of living with a supernatural life we will prove by showing that he is like the vital principle of the Church in 993.

992. Proof of the first minor, 2) the Holy Spirit is the quasi-principle of the unity and activity of the Mystical Body of Christ.

A) For the Holy Spirit is said to be the first principle of unity in the Church by St. Paul in 1 Cor. 12:12-13.

B) The Holy Spirit is shown as the first principle of activity: a) *Of the Head as such:* since he forms it in the Incarnation of Christ (Luke 1:35); since he manifests, constitutes and leads it in the preaching of the Gospel (Luke 3:22; 4:1.14.16-21); since he assists it in the redemptive oblation of

the cross (Heb. 9:13-15).¹⁴ Indeed, through the Incarnation the Son of God becomes the Head of the body of men, through the preaching of the Gospel Christ gathers together the Body of the Church, and through the oblation of the cross he fully exercised the office of Head of the Church.¹⁵

b) The Holy Spirit is also the first principle of activity of *the Body as such*. For, the activity of the Body of the Church as such is threefold: doctrinal, producing holiness, and governing. Indeed the Holy Spirit is spoken of as the first principle of activity, whether doctrinal (John 16:12-15); or of producing holiness, both in regeneration through Baptism and in restoration through Penance (John 3:5; 20:22f.); or as governing (Luke 24:48f.; Acts 1:1-8; 20:28).¹⁶

993. Proof of the first minor, 3) The Holy Spirit is the quasi-vital principle of the Mystical Body of Christ. For, the human soul, as a vital principle, is the first and fundamental principle from which specifically human life flows, that is, rational life. But in the Mystical Body of Christ the Holy Spirit is the first and fundamental quasi-principle, from which flows its specifically Christian life, that is, supernatural life. Therefore the Holy Spirit is the quasi-vital principle of the Mystical Body of Christ.

This minor is proved. A) The supernatural life of grace making man pleasing to God flows forth from the Holy Spirit as from its first and fundamental principle, as is clear from St. Paul: Rom. 8:5.6.9-17. b) The supernatural life of the charismatic gifts flows forth from the Holy Spirit as the first and fundamental principle, as St. Paul also testifies: 1 Cor. 12:3-11. c) Hence without doubt all the fruits of spiritual and supernatural life are rightly attributed by St. Paul to the Holy Spirit: Gal. 5:16-25. Therefore the Church appropriately directs us to believe "in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and giver of life" (D 150).¹⁷

994. Part 3. The Church is the house or Family of the children of God the Father.

It is proved 1) As the conclusion of the preceding parts. For, from what has been proved it is inferred that God the Father truly is the Founder and

14. Leo XIII, *Encycl. "Divinum illud"*: ASS 29 (1897) 647-649. St. Ambrose, *De Spiritu Sancto*, 1.1 c.8 n.98f.: ML 16,728; S.Th. *In Hebr* 9, lectg.3; St. Basil says: "All the action of our Savior takes place with the presence of the Holy Spirit," *De Spiritu Sancto* c.16 n.39: MG 32,140.

15. Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis"*: AAS 35,206.

16. Leo XIII, *Encycl. "Divinum illud"*: ASS 29 (1897) 649f.

17. See Y. Congar, *Le Saint-Esprit et le Corps apostolique, réalisateurs de l'oeuvre du Christ: Esquisses du Mystère de l'Eglise* (1953) 129-179. The Holy Spirit is called the soul, *as moving* to what is good (Beumer), or *as indwelling*, imperfectly under the title of faith and hope in sinners, but perfectly under the title of charity in the justified (Liegé): RevScPhTh 38 (1954) 736; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe incarné* (through efficiency and indwelling) 2,537-547.

Vivifier of the Church as the Family of the children of God. a) He is the Founder, because he sent into this world his Only-begotten Son, whom he generated from all eternity, so that the men believing in him might become children of God and as such to be united into one company, over which he established his Only-begotten Son as the Head (see John 1:11-14; Eph. 1:22; Rom. 8:29). He is the Vivifier, because in time he sent into this world the Holy Spirit, whom with the Son he spirated from eternity, so that the Spirit of the substantial love of the Father and the Son might, like a soul, vivify the company of the children of God (see John 14:5-17; Rom. 8:9.15-17).

Therefore because God the Father constituted his Only-begotten Son *Head* of the company of the Children of God, and because he gave the Spirit of the substantial love of the Father and the Son, in order to vivify, like a *soul*, the same company of the Children of God, that is, the Church, we can rightly conclude that the Church is the House or Family of the children of God the Father.

995. *It is proved* 2) From the testimonies of Scripture. a) The Church is called by St. Paul *the house of the living God* and indeed in a formal sense, as a Family (1 Tim. 3:15; see 3:5 and the context of chapters 1-3); and so Paul himself also calls the faithful *the members of the household of God* in the same formal sense or as the family of God (Eph. 2:19).¹⁸

b) The Church is described as the Family of the House of God, in which Christ is the Son in his own House, but Moses is a servant of the same house, and we constitute this same House (Heb. 3:1-6), and in fact not as just servants, but as brothers of the First-born Son (Rom. 8:28-30).

c) The father of the Family of the Church is God the Father, both because from him *every family in heaven and on earth is named* (Eph. 3:15), and also because, as a true Patriarch, he blessed men in Christ his Son; in him he chose them, and finally in his Only-begotten Son he predestined them for adoption as children of God (Eph. 1:3-6). Hence Christ rightly taught us how to pray to God, saying: *Our Father*, and he also instructed us when he said: *Call no man your father on earth, for you have one Father, who is in heaven* (Matt. 6:9; 23:9).

996. The conclusion of the thesis is this:

A. *The Church is the house* of God the Father: *God the Father* in it is like *the Father of a Family* in his own house, whose *children* we are;

B. *The Church is the Mystical Body* of Christ: *God the Son* in it is like *the Head of the Body*, whose *members* we are.

18. I. Knabenbauer, *Comment. In epist. ad Eph 2,19 and 1 Tim. 3:15*).

C. *The Church is the Temple of the Holy Spirit: God the Holy Spirit is in it like a vivifying Soul, of whose life we are partakers.*

D. Finally, the supernatural life of regeneration through Baptism in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit consists in this union with the Triune God, according to the command of Christ: *Baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* (Matt. 28:19).

997. Scholium 1. The doctrine of St. Thomas on the Mystical Body of Christ is contained especially in III, q. 8; *De ver.* q. 29. a. 4 and 5; 3 d.13 q.2 a.2; *Expos. In epist. S.Pauli:* Rom. 8:28-30 lect.6; 12,4-5 lect.2; 1 Cor. 12:4-30 lect.1-3; Eph. 1:22-23 lect.8; 2,19 lect.6; 4,15-16 lect.5; Col. 1:18-20, 24-28 lect.5-6; Heb. 3:1-6 lect.1; *Opusc. In Symbolum*, c.12.¹⁹

1) On Christ the Head of the Mystical Body (III, q. 8, a. 1,3 and 6).

A. *Christ as man is the Head of the Church* (III, q. 8, a. 1).

The reasons for being the Head are: a) sublimity; b) perfection; c) power of influencing the members. But in Christ a) sublimity is had from propinquity to God and from the resulting preeminence with relation to us; b) perfection is present from the absolute fullness of graces and gifts; c) his power is certain because from the fullness of Christ gifts and graces are derived for all. But it is to be noted that Christ as man instrumentally, but as God authoritatively grants gifts and graces to the members of his Mystical Body (III, q. 8, a. 1 ad 1).²⁰

998. B. *The members of Christ as Head* (III, q. 8, a.3).

The members of Christ as Head are all men but according to various grades. *First of all, actually* they are members, a) who are united with God in the Beatific Vision, b) who adhere to God in charity, c) who at least have faith in God. *Secondly*, they are only members *potentially*, d) unbelievers who in time will become believers, e) unbelievers who never embrace the faith. *Thirdly*, those are not even members *potentially*, f) who have turned away from God in eternal damnation. Therefore it should be noted that, according to this teaching, the Church may be taken in a broader sense; and so St. Thomas says: "The ancient Fathers (i.e., of the O.T.) were borne to Christ by the same faith and love whereby we also are borne to Him, and hence the ancient Fathers belong to the same Church as we" (III, q. 8, a. 3 ad 3).

999. C. *Only Christ properly and simply is the Head of the Church* (III, q. 8, a. 6).

Properly and simply the nature of Head is fulfilled in Christ alone, because only Christ by his power internally influences the members, by his own authority governs them, and

19. See M. Grabmann, *Die Lehre des hl.Thomas v. A. von der Kirche* (1903); Th. Kaeppli, *Zur Lehre des hl.Thomas v.A. vom corpus Christi Mysticum* (1931); Y. Congar, *L'idée de l'Eglise chez S.Thomas: Esquisses du mystère de l'Eglise* (1953) 59-91.

20. On the nature of Christ the Head, see also S.Th. *ad Eph* 1:23 lect.8.

by his activity influences all men of all times, as many as are members of the Church. The nature of head belongs to others only by participation and with certain limitations, because they can be said to be heads only through the external government and vicarious authority received from Christ, but not in such a way that their subjects can be called their members.

1000. 2) St. Thomas treats at length **the relation of Christ as Head to his members**, *De ver.* q.29, a. 4 and *ad Eph.* 4:16 lect.5.

3) Several points can be seen *on the union of members* in 3 d.13 q.2 sol.2 and ad 1; there he also mentions the quasi-Soul of the Mystical Body, which is the Holy Spirit. But *on the Creed*, c.12, he says: "the Soul that vivifies the Body of the Church is the Holy Spirit."

4) *That the Church is the House or Family* of the children of God the Father is also taught by St. Thomas, especially in *ad Eph.* 2:19 lect.6; *ad Heb.* 3:1-6 lect.1.²¹

1001. Scholium 2. The doctrine on the Mystical Body in Vatican Council I.

On this matter we do not have anything definite proposed by the Council. There is only the *Outline* proposed to the Fathers, and there are several comments left to us in writing from the Fathers of the Council concerning this matter; also there is the revised *Outline* by P. Kleutgen based on the amendments of the Fathers, but it was never proposed to the Fathers of the Council. Because of the forced closing of the Council, the Fathers were not able to have a public discussion about this doctrine.

1002. Outline I of the *Constitution "On the Church"* in its first chapter stated that the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ, as a fruitful notion, from which the remaining doctrine on the Church is derived: "*Chapter I. The Church is the Mystical Body of Christ.* The Only-begotten Son of God... being born in the likeness of men (Phil. 2:7) became visible in the assumed form of our body, so that earthly and carnal men putting on the new man, who after the likeness of God was created in justice and in true righteousness and holiness (Eph. 4:24), might form a Mystical Body, of which He is the Head. But in order to produce this union of the Mystical Body, Christ the Lord instituted the sacred washing of regeneration and renovation, by which the sons of men divided from one another by so many names, especially having been wounded by their sins and then cleansed of all stain of guilt, might be members to each other, and having been joined to their divine Head with faith, hope and charity, all might be vivified by his one Spirit, and receive abundantly the gifts of heavenly graces and charisms. But this is something which, as made permanently present to the minds of the faithful, can never be sufficiently recommended, namely, this excellent image of the Church, whose Head is Christ (Col. 1:18), and from whom the whole Body, joined and knit together by every joint with which it is supplied, when each part is working properly, makes bodily growth and upbuilds itself in love (Eph. 4:16)."²²

21. A. Mitterer, *op.cit.*, n.972 contrasts the teaching of St. Thomas with the teaching of the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*"; Ch. Journet disagrees: *BullThom* 8 (1952) 365-373. T. Zapelena seems to follow the opinion of Mitterer, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1954) 372-378.

22. Msi 51,539.

1003. *The Committee for the Faith*, in their *Comments* on this Outline, explained the importance of this doctrine, and the opportuneness and suitability of defining it, with these words: "To describe the nature of the Church according to the true and Catholic doctrine, it is established *in the first place* that she is the Mystical Body of Christ, because 1) in Holy Scripture the Church of Christ is proposed more frequently, accurately and clearly by no other outline; 2) because the intimate essence of the Church is contained in this outline, and the preeminent, that is, the divine image and force of it, from which as from the greater and more noble part the beginning of the description is drawn; added to this is 3) a polemical reason, namely, that right from the beginning is excluded the limitation which is common among the Reformers, both the more recent ones and the older ones, as if for Catholics the whole truth of the Church is reduced to external and sensible things only... Moreover it is apparent that 4) unless the internal image of the Church is kept before our eyes, it is not possible to evaluate properly those things that pertain to her external appearance; and it is known to all 5) that she is above all the image of the Mystical Body, which now among carnal and worldly men is either totally ignored, or not properly attended to as it should be; therefore it seemed necessary above all that it should be stirred up in the minds of the faithful."²³

1004. The judgment of the Council Fathers on this Outline was made known to us by the testimony of Fr. Kleutgen, a Vatican theologian, who in the *Comments on Outline II of the Constitution "On the Church"* says this: "It displeased many of the reverend Fathers that in the first Outline a symbolic definition of the Church was proposed, in which it is said to be the Body of Christ, as the head of the doctrine and the foundation of the things that follow from it." Therefore in *Outline II* the exposition is founded rather on this other notion of the Church: "Therefore the Church is the assembly of Christ's faithful, and a true society, but by far more distinguished than any human society, and therefore it is deservedly called the City of God and the Kingdom of heaven."²⁴ However, as the same Theologian points out: "But to exclude anything merely human or profane that this name of "society" could suggest, more proper and biblical names of the Church are immediately added, and with the explanation of these the fully divine and supernatural nature of the Church is shown regarding her origin, end and means used. These things also have the purpose to oppose the calumny that what is internal and spiritual is neglected by Catholics when they describe the Church... Therefore this was changed, in such wise that the name of the Church [Body of Christ] would be called to mind particularly, because in Scripture it is used more frequently and expressly than others, and it is very suitable in order to signify the properties of the Church."²⁵

1005. In *Outline II*, according to these criteria, the doctrine on the Mystical Body of Christ is not proposed as the foundation from which other things are drawn, but it is added as a really principal part in order to understand completely the intimate nature of

23. Msi 51,553.

24. Msi 53,309.

25. Msi 53,309.

the Church, in this way: "Scripture... calls the Church not only a Kingdom, but it likens it also to a spiritual house, to a holy temple and sheepfold; especially it teaches that she is a Body, whose Head indeed is Christ, but the members are the faithful. Therefore, like the members of a living Body, it is necessary that Christ's faithful be joined with each other, according to what the Apostle says: *For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body* (1 Cor. 12:12).²⁶

This Outline II was not proposed to the Council nor was it approved by the Committee for the Faith; however, it does help to remember that Vatican Council I certainly thought about defining the doctrine which holds that the Church is the Mystical Body of Christ.²⁷

1006. Scholium 3. The identity of the Mystical Body and the hierarchical Church. Concerning the concept of the Mystical Body compared with the concept of the visible Church, some Fathers of the Vatican Council said that these concepts are not of the same kind, and in particular Archbp. Doupanloup said: "The Mystical Body of Christ is broader than the visible Body of the Church and comprehends in its whole extension all the just, even those who (without their own fault) find themselves outside the communion of the Church."²⁸

But this doctrine does not seem to agree with what the Outlines of Vatican Council I proposed, and after the *Encyclicals* "*Satis cognitum*" of Leo XIII and "*Mystici Corporis*" of Pius XII, it cannot now be sustained. Of course it is true that the Body of Christ in a reduplicative way as Mystical is not the Church of Christ in a reduplicative way as visible, because the reason why the Body of Christ is called precisely "Mystical" are not those things in the Church that are precisely visible, but those things in the Church that constitute her supernatural life. However, if the concepts are taken only in a specifying way, surely it must be said that the Mystical Body of Christ is simply the visible Catholic Church of Christ. For, the doctrine on the Mystical Body of Christ is derived especially from St. Paul. "But the Pauline metaphor of Body is not fully verified either in the union which exists uniquely in virtue of the Incarnation, or in the Church since Abel, or in the Church which is in the Saints or the predestined, or in the exclusively learning Church; but only in the Catholic hierarchical Church which is teaching and at the same time learning. For, according to the mind of Paul, the Body of Christ is that visible hierarchical organization, which existed at the time of the Doctor of the Gentiles."²⁹

1007. Among Catholics, since the year 1914, there are some who, led by a spirit of *Irenicism*, distinguish fully the Mystical Body from the hierarchical Church, especially in order to concede that non-Catholic Christians, erring in good faith, really belong to

26. Msi 53,309.

27. E. Mersch, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* (1933) 2,326-332; J. Madoz, *La Iglesia Cuerpo místico de Cristo según el primer esquema "De Ecclesia" en el Concilio Vaticano*: RevEspT 3 (1943) 159-181.

28. Msi 51,785f. The Ecumenists affirm: "The Churches, although they are not members of the same visible body, still pertain to the same Mystical Body" and they say that this is also held by the Roman Church. See *World Council of Churches*, Minutes and Reports of the Central Committee, IV,3 (9-15 July 1950) p.87. See Irenikon 24 (1951) 42.

29. S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (1946) 167-186. T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia*, 2 (1954) 359-388.

the Mystical Body, and therefore are saved, although in the proper sense they are not members of the Catholic Church.³⁰ With this doctrine, they think that they can make possible an opening to the Panchristians fostering Ecumenism, who in order to obtain salvation hold that an internal union of the mind with Christ is necessary and sufficient, but that in no way is uniformity of doctrine or of life or of external organization required; so they hold that it makes no difference which Christian sect one belongs to.³¹

After the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis,"* Catholics generally embrace the traditional doctrine on the identity of the Mystical Body of Christ with the Roman Catholic Church, which we have always defended.³²

However some think that Pius XII with the identity, which he teaches, intended to reject only the *indifferentism* of the Panchristians, but in no way intended to prohibit that broader and traditional concept of the Mystical Body, according to which all the justified, even though they are not in the full sense members of the visible Church, nevertheless truly are said to belong to the Mystical Body of Christ. But Morel, explicitly attacking the teaching of P. Tromp, thinks that Pius XII is teaching that the Mystical Body *taken in a lofty or perfect sense* is identified with the Roman Catholic Church. But he, relying mainly on the teachings of Mersch and Cerfaux, holds that the Mystical Body *properly and simply* is a complex of all those who are habitually united with Christ through supernatural faith alone, even if they lack Baptism or belong to some other sect.³³

This view, which we thought could not be maintained after the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis,"* we now think is opposed to Catholic doctrine, after the *Encyclical "Humani generis"* which teaches: "Some say they are not bound by the doctrine, explained in Our Encyclical Letter of a few years ago, and based on the sources of revelation, which teaches that the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same thing."³⁴ He supposes the same thing, since in his *Encyclical "Sempiternus Rex"* he says: "Many of those who dwell in the East have unhappily fallen away from the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ" (AAS 43 [1951] 640f.).

1008. Scholium 4. On the Soul of the Mystical Body. We said that the Holy Spirit is the Soul, but the quasi-Soul of the Mystical Body. He is not called the Soul in the proper sense: 1) since he is not an incomplete substance that is substantially united to the Mys-

30. See E. Przywara, *Corpus Christi Mysticum*: ZAszMyst 15 (1940) 197-215; L. Bouyer, *Ou en est la théologie du Corps mystique*: RevScRel 22 (1948) 313-333.

31. G. Aulén, *L'Eglise a la lumière du N.T.*, and C.T. Craig, *L'Eglise du N.T.*: both are found in *Etudes Oecuméniques, Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu* v.1 (1949) p.23-58. See note 28.

32. Tromp, Bover, Feckes, Mitterer, *loc.cit.*, n.972; F. Amiot, *L'enseignement de St. Paul* (1946); P. Parente, *Theol. Fundam.* (1947) 148-154; J. Bonsirven, *L'Evangile de Paul* (1948). And in magazine articles: L. Malevez: *NouvRevTh* 67 (1945) 993-1015; D.C. Lialine: *Irenik* 20 (1947) 34-54; H. Bleinstein: *GeistLeb* 20 (1947) 234-238; A. Chevassé: *NouvRevTh* 70 (1948) 690-702; J. Brinktrine: *ThGl* 1948) 299; A. Liegé: *RevScPhTh* 32 (1948) 351-357; J. Beumer: *ThGl* 39 (1949) 259; 44 (1954) 321-338; H. Holstein: *Et* 267 (1950) 241-252; Strotmann: *Iren* 25 (1952) 249-262.

33. See Rahner, Mersch, Cerfaux, Goosens, *loc.cit.*, n.972; V. Morel, *Le Corps mystique du Christ et l'Eglise Catholique Romaine*: *NouvRevTh* 70 (1948) 703-726. *Nothomb*: *Iren* 25 (1952) 226-248. See note 25.

34. Pius XII, "*Humani generis*": AAS42 (1950) 571. See M. Labourdette, *Les enseignements de l'Encyclique "Humani generis"*: *RevThom* 50 (1950) 51; J. Vodopivec, *Ecclesia Catholica Romana Corpus Christi Mysticum*: *Euntes docete* 4 (1951) 76-95; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 (1951) 53-55, 59f., 80-83.

tical Body as its own form in the proper sense, and 2) consequently, he does not cause formally the effects of life of the Mystical Body, but only effectively or quasi-formally.

However, sanctifying grace and the other interior supernatural gifts much less can be called the Soul of the Mystical Body. For 1) they are not something substantial nor do they exist definitively in the Mystical Body, 2) and they are not intrinsically independent of the souls of the faithful, 3) nor are they one principle, and therefore they cannot be the principle of unity, 4) they are not the first and fundamental principle of the acts of the Body, but rather the effects which are produced and increased in it by another, 5) and they are not the principle simply of the acts of the Body as such, since the acts of the power of teaching, sanctifying and governing are exercised validly by ministers lacking grace. Wherefore, since it has to do with defining the substantial, one, first and fundamental principle of the life and of all the acts of the Body, it cannot be said that it is sanctifying grace and the other internal supernatural gifts, which are only the vital effects or proximate principles which the Holy Spirit, somewhat like a Soul, produces in the Body of the Church, as Pius XII says.³⁵

However, if the comparison or similitude is taken under a different aspect, namely, inasmuch as in man, all those things pertain to the body that can be perceived by the senses, but all those things that are insensible pertain to the soul; then surely all those things that in the Mystical Body of Christ that cannot be perceived immediately by the senses, can be called its soul, and therefore to the soul of the Church it must be said that they pertain—not only sanctifying grace and the other internal supernatural gifts, but also the three Divine Persons themselves, since by the divine power they operate sweetly in the Church and dwell especially in the souls of the just. Under this other aspect several other authors seem to accept the question, which, as Wilmers, Palmieri, De San and others hold, namely, that sanctifying grace and the created supernatural gifts are the soul of the Mystical Body.³⁶

1009. C. Journet has a singular opinion in this matter. He says that there are two souls in the Mystical Body of Christ: one is uncreated, the Holy Spirit, and the other is created, namely, sanctifying grace and the other created gifts associated with it.³⁷ Indeed it is true that in justification not only grace and the created gifts are infused into man, but also the uncreated gift of the Holy Spirit is given (D 1528f.). However, we think that sanctifying grace, and the created gifts accompanying it, cannot be said to be the soul of the Church in the sense in which we are speaking of it, because of the reasons just given (in #1008). And it is not correct to say that there are two souls of the Mystical Body, since, according to St. Paul, the Church is called a Body like the human body and in it two souls cannot be distinguished, because in the human body there are not two souls

35. M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* th.30; E. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* th.26; Pius XII: AAS 35,220.

36. See *Compendio della dottrina Cristiana*, prescribed by Pius X for the dioceses of the province of Rome (1905) 119: "In che consiste l'anima della Chiesa? L'anima della Chiesa consiste in ciò che essa ha d'interno e spirituale, cioè la fede, la speranza, la carità, i doni della grazia e dello Spirito Santo e tutti i celesti tesori che le sono derivati per meriti di Cristo Redentore e dei Santi." G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* th.74f.; A. Michelitsch, *Theol. Fundam.* § 199.

37. C. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 1 (1941) 42f.61-64, 625-630.640f.; 2 (1951) 565-579, 603-705. E. Sauras holds the same view, *El Cuerpo místico de Cristo* (1952) 820-844.

(D 1655 with the note [34th ed.]).

The created gifts of grace cannot suitably be called the vital principle, but rather they are the life itself which the Holy Spirit, as the principle of life, communicates to the members of the body, according to the clear teaching of the *Tridentine Catechism*: "It is one and the same Spirit who imparts grace to the faithful, *just as the soul gives life to the bodily members*" (p.1 a.9 n.12).

1010. Scholium. 5. On the relation of the Blessed Virgin Mary to the Mystical Body.

A. Doctrine of the Magisterium of the Church. Especially in the epilogue of the Bull "*Ineffabilis Deus*," of Pius IX Acta 1 (1814) 617f.; in the Encyclical "*Ad diem illum*" of Pius X Acta 1 (1904) 150-161; in the epilogue of the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*" of Pius XII: AAS 35 (1943) 247f. See S. Tromp, *Text.Docum., Ser.Theol.*, 26, *Lit.Encycl.* Annotations § 108f.; J.M. Bover, *La Mariologia en la Encycl. "Mystici Corporis,"* in *Soteriologia mariana* (1946) 495-520; J. Dillersberger, *Die Stellung Marias in der Heilordnung nach "Mystici Corporis"* (1947); C. Feckes, *Die Kirche als Herrenleib, Erläuterung zur Enzykl. "Mystici Corporis"* (1949) 169-173; H. du Manoir, *Maria* 1 (1949) 552-556, 573-601, 604-607.

B. Doctrine of Scripture. F.M. Braun, *Marie et l'Eglise d'après l'Ecriture: Etud-Mar* (1952) 7-21; A.Bea-A.Merk, *Marienburg des A. und N. Bundes*, in P. Straeter, *Maria in der Offenbarung* (1952) 23-84.

C. Doctrine of the holy Fathers. H. Holstein, A. Mueller, H. Barré in *Marie et l'Eglise: EtudMar* (1951) 11-143; I. Ortiz de Urbina, H. Rahner, in P. Straeter, *loc. cit.*, 85-1181, 37-182; G. Montague, *AmerEcclRev* 123 (1950) 331-337; A. Mueller, *Ecclesia-Maria* (1951); H. Rahner, *Maria und die Kirche* (1951); H. de Lubac, *L'Eglise et la Vierge Marie*, in *Méditation sur l'Eglise* (1953) 241-285; H. Coathalen, *Le parallélisme entre la S.Vierge et l'Eglise dans la tradition latine jusqu'à la fin du XII^e siècle: AnalGreg* 74 (1954). See H. Lennerz, *Maria-Ecclesia: Greg* 35 (1954) 90-98.

D. Testimonies of the Liturgy. G. Frenaud, *Liturgies latines de VII^e au XI^e siècle: EtudMar* (1951) 39-58; H. Engberding, Ph. Oppenheim, *Oestliche und lateinische Liturgie*, in P. Straeter, *loc.cit.*, 119-136, 183-267.

E. Doctrine of Theologians. a) *Middle Ages*: I. Riudor: *EstEcl* 25 (1951) 181-218; A. Piolanti: *EuntDoc* 4 (1951) 324-338; M. Mueller, in P. Straeter, *loc. cit.*, 268-316. b) *Recent Theologians*: M.J. Scheeben, *Dogmatik* 3 p.455-629; J.B. Terrien, *La Mère de Dieu* p.2 l.8 c.1-3; J. Anger, *L'Eglise, société mariale, ou Marie, mère du Corps mystique*, in *La doctrine du Corps mystique*, p.3 c.3; J.V. Bainvel, *De habitudine Mariam inter et Ecclesiam*, in *De Ecclesia* p.97f.; L. Colomer, *La Virgen tipo, Madre y corazón de la Iglesia*, in *La Iglesia*, p.2 l.2 c.2; C. Feckes, *Maria und die Kirche*, in *Das Mystereium der hl.Kirche*, p.264-275; F. Jürgensmeier, *Die Gottesmutter in der Frömmigkeit des*

Corpus Mysticum, in *Der mystische Leib Christi*, p.326-338; H. Rondet, *La Vierge dans le Corps mystique*: *EtudMar* 1937) 195-232; O. Semmelroth, *Maria Urbild der Kirche* (1950); Ch. Journet, *La Vierge au Coeur de l'Eglise*, in *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, 2 (1951), 382-453; J. Lécuyer, R. Laurentin, M. Philipon, in *Marie et l'Eglise*: *EtudMar* (1952) 23-86; J. Beumer, C. Feckes, P. Straeter, A. Stolz, in P. Straeter, *Maria in der Glaubenswissenschaft* (1952); S. Tromp, *Die Sendung Mariens und das Geheimnis der Kirche*: *ThCl* 43 (1953) 401-410; E. Sauras, *El Cuerpo místico* (1952) 486-525; R. Laurentin, A. M. Henri, J. Bonnefoy, C. Dillenschneider, Th. Koehler, M.J. Nicolas, in *EtudMar* (1953) 2-170.

F. The place which Mary occupies in the Mystical Body of Christ. a) A. Fernández, with a few others, holds that *Mary is the secondary Head of the Church*: *CiencTom* 38 (1928) 122-158. b) G.M. Roschini, with several previous authors in the 17th century, argues that *Mary is the neck of the Church*: *Mariologia* 2 (1948) 349-367. c) *That Mary is like the maternal heart of the Church* is defended, along with some medieval scholars, by several recent Theologians, like Scheeben, Terrien, Arintero, Hugon, Aguilar, Mura, Feckes, Gillet, Musger, García-Garcés, McCarty, A. Lühr, in the places cited by Roschini, p.349-358, to which can be added Colomer and Tromp in the places cited under E. d) Sauras is opposed to the use in Theology of metaphors (neck, heart, etc.) which are not found in revelation, however with Bover (*loc.cit.*, p.91.248) he approves the teaching about the secondary headship of Mary, although he thinks that it is not correct to call her the head.

1. *Mary as the type and exemplar of the Church and the Mediatrix of the graces of Christ.*

God the Father chose and predestined Mary as the immaculate and as full of grace, so that in her and from her might be formed the Head of the Mystical Body—the Only-begotten Son of the Father according to the flesh. Accordingly, he proposed her as the type of the Church “without stain or wrinkle,” and as the example of those in whom Christ would be formed (Gal. 4:9), namely, members of the Mystical Body and brothers of the Only-begotten in the house or family of God the Father. Hence, because the Father decreed that by means of Mary the fount itself of graces, Christ the Lord, should be given to us, therefore it is rightly concluded that Mary was constituted by God as the *Mediatrix* of all graces, which are conferred on the members of the Mystical Body by Christ the Head.

2. *Mary the Mother of the Mystical Body and the Coredeemtrix of all men* (D 3370).

The Son of God, with Mary's consent (Luke 1:45), was incarnated in her and born from her, so that through the nature assumed from Mary he might be the Savior of men and the Head of the Mystical Body. Therefore in the womb of the Virgin, Christ both assumed flesh for himself and at the same time united it with his Mystical Body. Hence in a mystical way we are said to be the children of Mary, and she is our spiritual *mother*. Mary standing next to the Cross, with the charity with which she burned for God, because of the perpetual union of the will and sufferings of the Mother with her Son, she offered Him to God the Father for us, together with the holocaust of her maternal rights

and maternal love. Therefore, being a participator and companion in the sufferings of the Redeemer, she merited to become the *Coredemptrix* of men.

3. *Mary is the Queen of the world and the Dispensatrix of all graces in the Mystical Body.*

The Holy Spirit filled Mary with his highest gifts and made her a temple of all holiness, so that from her would be born the Holy King of the world and of glory, Christ. Accordingly, Mary was constituted by God the Queen of heaven and earth and the Mother of mercy, that she might administer the treasures of the merits of his Son and of the graces of the divine Spirit with what may be called her maternal right. Hence Mary, filled with the divine Spirit, is present as Queen at the right hand of the King in heaven, the faithful helper of all men, the chief attendant in granting graces and the *Dispensatrix* of all the gifts of the divine Spirit; being vigilant with her maternal love, she strives with constant prayer that the abundant riches of the merits of the Head and the inexhaustible flow of the graces of the Soul of the Mystical Body may be poured out continually on all its members (see Pius IX, X and XII, *loc. cit.* under A).

1011. Objections. 1. The Holy Spirit cannot be said to be the substantial form of the Mystical Body. Therefore also he is not its soul.

I distinguish the antecedent. The Holy Spirit cannot be said to be a spiritual substance, as definitively existing in the Mystical Body, which efficiently and quasi-formally causes life in it, like the life which the soul causes formally in the human body, *denied*; the Holy Spirit cannot be said to be an incomplete substance, which is united to the Mystical Body substantially so that in it formally it may cause life, like the soul in a human body, *I subdistinguish*: and such a form must be required for a physical body, which is capable of such information, *conceded*; and such a form can be required for a moral body, like the Church, which is not capable of such information, *denied*.

2. It is repugnant to pure act that it should be conceived as entering into a composition. But as the Soul of the Mystical Body, the Holy Spirit is conceived as entering into a composition. Therefore it is repugnant that the Holy Spirit be called the Soul of the Church.

I distinguish the major. It is repugnant that the Holy Spirit be conceived as entering into a natural composition, *conceded*; supernatural, *I subdistinguish*: which demands a change in pure Act, is repugnant, *conceded*; which demands a change only in the terminus, is repugnant, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; the consequent and the consequence are denied.*

1012. 3. That is not the first and fundamental principle of life in the Church which presupposes something else. But the Holy Spirit in the Church presupposes sanctifying grace as the foundation of the relation of his presence in a just soul. Therefore the Holy Spirit is not the first and fundamental principle of life in the Church.

I distinguish the major. If it presupposes the other in the same order of causality, *conceded*; if it presupposes the other in a different order of causality, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* The Holy Spirit presupposes sanctifying grace in the order of formal causality, or as the foundation of the relation of his presence as passively possessed by

the just soul, *conceded*; in the order of efficient causality, or as the foundation of the relation of his presence as actively vivifying the just soul, *denied*.

1013. 4. "What is the principle of life of individuals, is also that of the whole Church, because she consists of individuals joined to her. But sanctifying grace is the principle of the supernatural life of individuals."³⁸ Therefore sanctifying grace is the principle of the supernatural life of the whole Church.

I bypass the major and distinguish the minor. For individuals sanctifying grace is the accidental, manifold, proximate and formal principle of supernatural life, *I bypass the minor*; it is the substantial, one, first and efficient principle, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Sanctifying grace is the accidental, manifold, proximate and formal principle of the supernatural life of the whole Church, *I bypass the consequent*; the substantial, one, first and efficient principle, *denied*.

1014. 5. What the formal principle is of the Body of the Church should be clearly defined. But the formal principle of the Body of the Church is sanctifying grace. Therefore sanctifying grace is the Soul of the Body of the Church.

I distinguish the major. What the quasi-formal principle is of the Body of the Church should be clearly defined, *conceded*; what is properly the formal principle of the Body of the Church, *I subdistinguish*: if the moral Body of the Church were capable of such information, *I bypass that*; if the moral Body of the Church is not capable of such information, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Sanctifying grace would be the formal principle, if the moral Body of the Church were capable of a real information, *I bypass the minor*; if it is not capable of such information, *denied*.

1015. 6. Authority is the soul of a social body. But the Church is a social body. Therefore authority is the soul of the Church.

I distinguish the major. Authority is the soul of a natural social body, *I bypass the major*; a supernatural social body, *I subdistinguish*: if in it the social being can be separated from the supernatural being, *I bypass that*; if in it the social being cannot be separated from the supernatural, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* The Church is a true merely natural social body, *denied*; supernatural, *I subdistinguish*: in which the social being cannot be separated from the supernatural being, *conceded*; in which the social being can be separated from the supernatural, *denied*.³⁹

38. G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.51.

39. D. Palmieri, *De. Rom. Pontif. Prolegom. de Ecclesia* th.11. M. D'Herbigny refutes him, *De Ecclesia* th.30.

ARTICLE II

ON THE REASON WHY MEMBERS OF THE
CHURCH ARE CONSTITUTED**Thesis 25. Valid Baptism is required and sufficient to constitute members of the Body of the Church.**

1016. S.Th. III, q. 8, a. 3; q. 70, a.1; Suarez, *De fide*, d.9 s.1; Bellarmine, *De Eccl. milit.* L.3 c.2-3; Cano, *De locis*, l.4 c.2-3; Franzelin, th.22-23; Wilmers, th.107-108; Tanqueray, 1 n.892-906; De San, n.345-359; Van Laak, *Repetit.* (1911) 185-197; Straub, th.31-32; Muncunill, n.615-636; Billot, th.10; D'Herbigny, th.33; Bavinck, th.19; Dieckmann, n.958-960; Dorsch, p.485-487; De Guibert, th.21; S. Fraghi, *De membris Ecclesiae* (1937); Stolz (1939) p.27-34; Vellico (1940) th.14; Journet, 2 (1951) 1056-1081; Sauras, *El Cuerpo Místico* (1952) 581-609; Zapelena, 2 (1954) 341-358; L. Rodrigo, *De Legibus*, n.138-163.

1017. Connection. We have proved that the Church is a perfect society and is constituted like a human body. Actually in every perfect society its citizens are constituted and recognized as such by some visible norm; hence we now ask what the main visible element is whereby members of the Church are constituted as such.

1018. Definition of terms. The idea of a *member* must be clearly distinguished from the notion of a subject and of one only bound to enter the Church. *The man bound to something* is he on whom the competent authority imposes some obligation antecedent to every social bond: thus, for example, all men are bound to worship God. *A subject* is said to be someone who is under the *social* power of another.

A member is called that which is united to some organic body as an integral part of it.

1019. Now if we transfer these notions to the Church, we have the following results: a) *Those bound to enter the Church* are those on whom Christ has placed an obligation to join his Church; such are all men on earth, as is inferred from thesis 3.

b) *Subjects of the Church* are those who are under the *social* power of the Church; according as this subjection is more or less perfect, the reason also for the subjection can be more or less perfect. Therefore, *subjects* of the Church are thought to be all those who have been baptized, even if they are heretics or schismatics or excommunicated persons who are to be

shunned, according to the rule of CIC 87 [1917].¹

c) *Members of the Church* are those who are united to the body of the Church as an integral part; according as this union is more or less full, also the nature of the membership is given more or less fully. We think that *the members of the Church* are all those validly baptized, in whom the bonds of union with the Church have not been broken either by heresy or schism or excommunication, as we explain in this thesis and intend to prove.²

1020. *The body of the Church* is all that which pertains to it inasmuch as it is a visible society of men. Someone can be a member of the body of the Church in two ways, namely, either actually or only in desire.³ *A member in reality* is a person who is united with the body of the body of the Church with a real and visible bond. But a *member in desire* is a person who because of his good will (= desire) becomes a participator from God of the life which is proper to Body of the Church, as will be explained in the thesis on the necessity of the Church (thesis 27).

1021. *A baptized person* is one who has received the Sacrament of Baptism instituted by Christ. Therefore we require Baptism which they call of *flowing water* or of water; and therefore the Baptism which is called of *blood* or of martyrdom and the Baptism which is called of *desire* or of charity are not sufficient, although we admit that by charity and martyrdom sanctifying grace is always obtained, "since both take the place of Baptism of water."⁴

The sacrament of Baptism can be received in three way, namely, in the proper manner, validly and fruitfully. *Baptism conferred in the proper manner* is that in which nothing is lacking of the sensible elements that are necessarily required in order to confer it. Baptism administered in the proper manner is *valid* when it is conferred *with the necessary intention* of the one being baptized and of the minister. A valid Baptism is *fruitful* which is conferred on a subject *aptly disposed* in order to receive its fruit or grace. Therefore distinguishing these three; the sensible *rite*, the necessary *intention* and the *disposition* of the recipient, for a Baptism rightly conferred the first one suffices, for a valid Baptism the first two are required and suffice, and finally for a fruitful Baptism the three are required, and therefore these varieties of Baptism are distinguished one from another only inadequately.

1. CIC 87: "By Baptism is constituted a person in the Church of Christ with all the rights and duties of Christians, unless, in what pertains to the law, there is some obstacle impeding the bond of ecclesiastical communion, or a censure imposed by the Church." See G. Michiels, *Normae, general. Iur. Can.* 1 (1949) 348.
2. On the distinction of the concepts of member and subject, see A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.1265; H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1911) 188; L. Rodrigo, *De Legibus* n.120.
3. See S.Th. III, q. 68, a. 2.3.
4. See S.Th. III, q. 66, a. 4.11.

1022. The adversaries in general are all those who either formally or equivalently deny that some visible element is required in order to constitute the true Church.

Tertullian, as a *Montanist*, who acknowledged as true only “the Church of the Spirit by the spiritual man,”⁵ was the true originator of the errors which were defended in the Middle Ages by the *Cathars*, *Waldensians*, *Albigensians*, *Fraticelli*, and other sects of the so-called “Spirituals,” who held that Christ’s faithful are constituted true members of the Church not by some visible thing, but only by the internal gifts of the Spirit.⁶

Wycliffe derived his teaching from the same principles and Hus took almost his whole Ecclesiology from there⁷; he held that the members of the Church are constituted only by the *predestination* of God (D 1201-1206, 1221).

1023. But Luther and Calvin, since in their teaching on the Church obviously they depend on Wycliffe and Hus; hence deservedly Tertullian is called “the father of the Spiritualism of the Protestants of the West.”⁸ Both Lutheran and Calvinist *Protestants* deny that any visible thing is required to constitute members of the Church. *Lutherans*, because they hold that the Church is nothing other than “the invisible and spiritual congregation of the just,” perceptible by faith alone⁹; and the *Calvinists* who teach that “the Church is the society of the *predestined* faithful, known to the one God, who alone knows whom he has chosen.”⁹

More recently those opposed are Sabatier, Harnack, Barth, and many others, holding that the Church is made up only of those who feel within themselves an internal, Christian sense of sonship towards God the Father, or they experience a certain lofty motion received immediately from God, so that they become “the living congregation of the living Christ the Lord.” We treated this above in n.42-43.¹⁰

1024. Opinions of Theologians. There are several particulars on this matter, about which Catholic Theologians dispute, but on all of the main points they generally agree with the teaching of St. Thomas. St. Thomas and Suarez speak about the Church understood *in the broad sense* and *in the strict sense*. They define the Church in the broad sense as “the congregation of the

5. Tertullian, *De pudic.* 21; *De virginibus velandis*, 1: ML 2,889f.1024f.

6. D 793-794, 893, 911, 912, 914.

7. See L. Loserth, *Hus*: RealEncyclProfThK 8,472-489.

8. F. Heiler, *Altchristliche Autonomie und päpstlicher Zentralismus* (1941) p.12.

9. Luther, *Responsio ad lib. A.Catharini* (1951) Ed. Weimar, 7, p.299; Calvin, *Catechismus Ecclesiae genevensis*, Ed. K. Müller, p.125.

10. On the adversaries of this thesis you can find more below in numbers 1072-1075, 1128, and in our explanation, *El Derecho en el Misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 211-238.

faithful, who have existed from the beginning of the world until its end.” But they understand the Church in the strict sense as the society of those who through Baptism as through the Sacrament of Faith are incorporated into Christ, as will be seen in Scholium 2 below in numbers 1039-1041.

1025. It should be well noted that the distinction of the Church taken *in the broad sense*, from that which is said *in the strict sense*, in no way implies a distinction of two coexisting Churches, but it means only that there are two stages of the same Church, and also that there can now be two ways of belonging *to the exact same Body of the Church*—one, according to the terminology of St. Thomas, *mentally* or *in desire*, but the other *in a physical way* or *in reality*, as will be clear from what we will say in Scholium 2 in n.1039, and as was explained above briefly in numbers 155-158.¹¹

Now since in our thesis we are asking who those are who *in reality* belong to the Body of the Church, which Christ established on the Apostles, rightly we prescind from those things the authors speculate about concerning the *generic* reason under which those also, who in the stage of preparation for the Church believed in Christ *who was going to come*, and can be said to belong to the same Church of Christ.

1026. But the Theologians who do not digress from the state of our question, and so inquire about the members of the Church understood in the strict sense, that is, about the members of that Church which was instituted by Christ on the Apostles, disagree on particular points, especially concerning the nature of the Baptism that is required.

That the members of the Church *in reality* are *all and only those baptized* can be said to be the truly unanimous opinion, according to what has already been said.

a) That a Baptism *properly conferred* suffices, even if it is invalid because of a defect of intention, is held by Bellarmine, Kilber, Straub, Pesch, and others.¹²

b) That a *valid* Baptism is required is defended by Franzelin, Palmieri, Wilmers, Van Laak, Billot, Bainvel, Muncunill, Dorsch, Schultes, Tanquerey, Zapelena, Fraghi, Stolz, Calcagno, Hervé, and many others.¹³

11. See what we wrote about the several meanings that the word “Church” has above in in #149f.155-158. See G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.386; M. D’Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.353. I. Urban proposed this as a middle way to the union of Christians: “Given the distinction between the concept of the Church, inasmuch as it is a social Body and inasmuch as it is the Mystical Body of Christ, nothing prevents us from saying that the Orientals, although under the social aspect they are separated from us, are members of the Mystical Body of Christ, and that under this aspect we embrace them as brother in Christ” (*Acta I Conventus Velehradensis* [1908] 25).

12. St. R. Bellarmine, *De Ecclesia militanti* l.3 c.10; H. Kilber, *De principis theolog.* in Wireburgenses, t.1 n.93; C. Mazzella, *De Ecclesia* n.595; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.1304; Ch. Pesch, *Praelect.* 1 n.329; Id., *Compendium* 1 n.231; Lercher, *Instit. theol.* 1 (1927) n.419.

13. I.B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia* th.23 n.3; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pont. Proleg de Ecclesia* § 11 n.7; G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.390; H. Van Laak, *Repetitorium* (1911) 186; L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* th.10 § 3; A. Tanquerey, *Synop. theol.* 1 n.898; J.V. Bainvel, *De Ecclesia* n.58; G. Van Noort, *De Ecclesia* n.152; I. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.621; V. Zubizarreta, *Theol. Fundam.* n.393; Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 487; A. Michelitsch, *Theol. Fundam.* § 200; R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.12; J. de Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.182; T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 p.389f; M. D’Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* th.33; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Instit. theol.* 1 n.412; A. Stolz, *De Ecclesia* 29; S. Fraghi, *De membris Ecclesiae* 67; A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* th.14 p.536; P. Parante, *Theol. Fundam.* 171; F.X. Calcagno, *Theol. Fundam.* n.287; J.M. Hervé, *Manuale Theolog.* t.1 n.448.

1027. State of the question. We are treating the Church *in the strict sense*, that is, about the Church that was instituted by Christ. We are asking about those who belong to its Body, or to the Church which and inasmuch as it is a visible society of men. And we are also inquiring about who belongs to the Church *in reality*, that is, not just *in a putative way*, but *effectively*; not only *in desire*, but *in reality*.

The thesis has two parts.

In the first part we hold that all and only the baptized are members of the Church, or that Baptism of itself suffices and is required in order *in reality to establish* members of the Church of Christ.

In the second part we defend that a *valid* Baptism is required, but we abstract from the further question, namely, whether Baptism is required *in a reduplicative way* as valid or not, holding that it is required to be valid at least *in a specifying way*.

1028. Doctrine of the Church. PART 1: a) That *all the baptized* are members of the Church, or that Baptism of itself suffices to constitute members of the body of the Church is taught by the *Council of Florence* in the decree for the Armenians : D 1314; and the same thing implicitly is defined by the *Council of Trent*, since it openly defines that all the baptized, in virtue of Baptism itself and antecedently to the will of the baptized, are absolutely bound to observe the universal law of Christ: D 1621f., 1627, and since it adds that because of their Baptism little children are to be numbered among the faithful: D 1626; the reason for this is the one offered by Trent itself, by defining that: “one enters the Church through the door of Baptism” or “they are made members of his body by the bath of Baptism”: D 1671. Hence the Church has rightly decreed with her law: “By Baptism a man is constituted in the Church of Christ a person with all the rights and duties of Christians” (CIC 87 [1917]).

b) That *only the baptized* are members of the Church, or that Baptism of itself is required to constitute members of the Body of the Church is defined implicitly in the *Council of Trent*: D 1671, where it says that the non-baptized are outside of the Church, and therefore it is not in the power of the Church to judge them. Hence also CIC 12 [1917] says: “Those who have not received Baptism are not bound by ecclesiastical laws.” Vatican I in the first draft of the *Constitution “On the Church,”* c.1, wrote: “To effect the union of the Mystical Body, Christ the Lord instituted the holy bath of regeneration and renewal by which the sons of men... become members

with each other and are joined to their divine Head.”¹⁴

1029. Pius XII in the *Encyclical “Mystici Corporis*, openly says this:

“The human body has its own means for fostering the life, health and growth of itself and each of its members. And the Savior of the human race in his infinite goodness has in like manner adequately equipped his Mystical Body by endowing it with the Sacraments... By Baptism those who have been born to this mortal life are regenerated from the death of sin and made members of the Church, and also invested with a spiritual character which makes them able and fit to receive the other Sacraments....” “Actually only those are to be included as members of the Church who have been baptized and profess the true faith.”¹⁵

1030. The theological note of our doctrine. PART 1. That *all and only the baptized* are members of the Church is *implicitly defined* in the Council of Trent. PART 2. That a *valid* Baptism is required is a *conclusion certain in Theology*, or at least *more probable*.

1031. Proof. PART 1: **The members of the Body of the Church in reality are all and only the baptized.**

a) *All*: 1 Cor. 12:12f.: *For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members are one body, so it is with Christ [namely, the mystical Christ of the Church]. For by one Spirit WE WERE ALL BAPTIZED INTO ONE BODY.* Gal. 3:27-28: *For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek... for you are all one in Christ Jesus.* In Col. 2:11-12 St. Paul compares Baptism with Circumcision and he attributes to it a more excellent power. But the Jews by Circumcision were incorporated into the chosen people. Therefore a fortiori Christians by Baptism are incorporated into the Church.

b) *Only*: John 3:5: *Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.* Matt. 28:19: *Go therefore and MAKE DISCIPLES of all nations, BAPTIZING THEM in the name of the Father and of the son and of the Holy Spirit.* Acts 2:41: *So those who received his word WERE BAPTIZED, AND THERE WERE ADDED that day about three thousand souls.*

1032. c) Formulas used in the administration of Baptism express very well the sense of the Church in this matter. *The Roman Ritual*: “Grant we beseech you, O Lord, to our chosen one that... he may be renewed by the fount of Baptism and numbered

14. Msi 51,539. Take into consideration the whole text of the draft concerning this matter.

15. Pius XII, *Encycl. “Mystici Cororis”*: AAS 35 (1943) 201f. D 3802.

among the members of your Church.”¹⁶ *The Manual of Toledo*: “We seal with the divine character, as the sheep of Christ, and we join and connect them to Christ the Head as his members.”¹⁷ *The Mozarabic Liturgy*: “All those who are baptized in Christ, put on Christ, so that those who have been baptized in the name of the Triune Majesty... may merit to be inscribed in the number of the faithful.”¹⁸ In the *Gallican Church*: “All those who are baptized in Christ, put on Christ... we refer the graces to the Lord, who has deigned to increase the congregation of his Church through our dear ones who have just been baptized.”¹⁹ In the *Church of Antioch*: “May they be worthy of the supernal regeneration through water and the Spirit: so that they may be sheep of the true Shepherd signed with the seal of your Holy Spirit, and become honorable members in the Body of your holy Church.”²⁰ In the Churches of *Constantinople, Alexandria and the Coptic, Ethiopian and Greek Churches*: “That Christ may be formed in regenerating this person, who through me, an abject and miserable man, he may receive the Baptism of regeneration. Build him up on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets... and plant and insert him like a seed of truth in your holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church.”²¹ In the *Jerusalem and Syrian Churches*: “Those who are baptized— perfect them and establish them as members of the family of Christ, cleansing them with your holy bath.” “I mark N. with the oil of gladness that he may be inserted into the good olive tree in the Apostolic Church.” “May the spiritual Lamb seal N. in the flock of Christ in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”²²

The Order of Severus of Antioch: “Someone who has been prepared for Baptism... number him with the spiritual and holy sheep”... “fashion and form your Christ in this person, who is to be regenerated through my weakness”... “the simple lamb is anointed with oil, and numbered among the children of the heavenly Father”... “May N. be baptized so that he will be a lamb in the flock of Christ in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”²³ *The Order of St. James of the Maronite Syrians*: “Receive, O Lord, the lambs who have come to Baptism, and join them to your flock along with the lambs at your right hand. Open your gates, O holy Church, and receive the simple lambs who today have come for Baptism”... “Good Shepherd, who have sealed your sheep with the sign of the Trinity... may the simple lamb of your flock be marked and through your mark be numbered with your sheep; may he be yours and may he be protected against

16. *Rituale Romanum* tit.2 c.4, rule for the Baptism of adults, n.3.

17. *Manuale Toletanum*, Appendix to the Roman Ritual, tit.2 c.1 § 55.

18. *Liturgia Mozarabica, Missale mixtum* part 1: ML 85,465f. The sentence: *Those who have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ* (Gal. 3:27), occurs also in the Office of Baptism of the Armenian Church: J.A. Assemani, *Codex Liturgicus* 2.201.209.

19. *Ordo Baptismi in Ecclesia Gallicana*: J.A. Assemani, *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae universae* 2,38f.43. See the similar Orders of the particular Churches of Poitiers in France and Laudensis in Italy: Assemani, 2,61.78.

20. *Ordo Ecclesiae Antiochenae Syrorum*: Assemani, 1,220.

21. *Ordo Baptismi Ecclesiarum Constantinopolitanae et Graecorum necnon Alexandrinae, Copticae et Aethyopicae*: Assemani, 2,132,134.162. A similar *Ordo* of the Church of Antioch in Syria: Assemani, 1,230.

22. *Ordo Ritualis Syrorum et Ecclesiae Hierosolymitanae*; *Ordo Baptismi Ecclesiae Antiochenae et Hierosolymitanae Syrorum*, and also *Philoxeni Mahugensis Episcopi*: Assemani, 2,223.232.285.307. See Assemani, 1,240.255.

23. *Ordo syriacus Severi Patriarchae Antiocheni*: Assemani, 2,268.277.297.299.

all evils"... "May N. be sealed as a lamb in the Christian flock, with the living oil of the divine anointing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit"... "I baptize you, N., as a lamb in the flock of Christ in the name of the Father, etc."²⁴ In the *Order of the Armenian Church*: "May he be the body and the member of your Holy Church."²⁵ In the *Order of the Syrian Ritual, of the Jerusalem Church and of Severus of Antioch*: "Spread out your wings, O Holy Church, and receive this simple lamb, whom the Holy Spirit has generated from the waters of Baptism"... "Hail, new lamb, son born from Baptism, whom I generated from the waters in the name of the Trinity."²⁶

According to these testimonies of the Liturgies, *Baptism suffices* to constitute members of the Church, because men are said to become part of the Church by Baptism itself; *Baptism is required*, because without it they are not thought to be part of the Church.

1033. d) The same doctrine is confirmed by the authority of the holy Fathers.

St. Irenaeus: "For as a compacted lump of dough cannot be formed of dry wheat without fluid matter, nor can a loaf possess unity, so, in like manner, neither could we, being many be made one in Christ Jesus without the water from heaven" (R 220).

Tertullian: "But we, little fishes, after the example of our IXTUS Jesus Christ, are born in water, nor have we safety in any other way than by permanently abiding in [that] water" (R 302).

St. Methodius: "The Church swells and travails until birth until Christ is born in us, so that each of the saints, by partaking of Christ, has been born a Christ... It is as though those who were baptized into Christ had been made Christ by communication of the Spirit, the Church contributing here her parts for their transformation into the image of the Word" (R 613).

St. John Chrysostom: "The citizens of the Church... are not just the free but also the holy, not just the holy but also the justified, not just the justified but also the sons, not just the sons but also the heirs, not just the heirs but also the brothers of Christ, not just the brothers of Christ but also the co-heirs, not just the co-heirs but also the members, not just the members but also the temple, not just the temple but also the organs of the Spirit. You see how many benefits there are of Baptism... For this reason we also baptize infants... so that holiness, justification, adoption, inheritance and the brotherhood of Christ may be given to them, that they may be his members" (R 1228).

St. Augustine: "His saints imitate Christ in the pursuit of justice. But besides this imitation, his grace works within us our illumination and justification... For by this grace he engrafts into his body even baptized infants, who certainly have not yet become able to imitate anyone" (R 1715).

He says the same thing in *Epist.* 265, n.4: "We read that whoever is in the Body of

24. *Ordo Ritualis Syrorum Maronitarum S. Iacobi Sarugensis Episcopi*: Assemani, 2,315f.

25. *Ordo Ecclesiae Armenorum*: Assemani, 1 172. There are many other like these in the *Ordo Baptismi Ecclesiae Antiochenae Syrorum*: Assemani, 1,222f.226.

26. This beautiful formula occurs frequently: Assemani, 2,225.237.243.300.

Christ, which is the Church, belongs to the Kingdom of heaven, and we must understand that this refers only to the baptized" (ML 33,1087).

St. Fulgentius: "I think... that then each one of the faithful becomes a partaker in the Lord's Body and Blood, when by Baptism he is made a member of Christ's Body, and that he is not prevented from sharing in that bread and cup, even if before he eats that bread and drinks that cup, he departs from this world after having been constituted in the unity of the Body of Christ" (R 2237).

1034. PART 2: Valid Baptism is required.

The Baptism which is required to constitute in reality members of the Body of the Church is a *valid Baptism*. For, 1) Baptism, even if properly conferred, if it is *invalid* is *not sufficient*, because in the thesis we are asking, how men are constituted members of the Church in reality, that is, not just putatively and apparently, but also effectively and *really*. But by an invalid Baptism, although properly conferred, persons can be constituted members of the Church only putatively and apparently, but not effectively and really. Therefore Baptism, although conferred properly, if it is invalid does not suffice to really constitute members of the Body of the Church.

2) *Valid Baptism is required*, because in order to constitute members of the Church in reality, that is, effectively and really, that Baptism is required whereby persons are rendered *capable* of participating in the specific and principal social goods of the Church, which are the Sacraments. But only by a valid Baptism are persons rendered *capable* of participating in such social goods of the Church, that is, the Sacraments. Therefore valid Baptism is required in order really to constitute members of the Body of the Church.

3) *Valid Baptism is required*, because in order to constitute members of the Body of the Church really what is required, according to Scripture and the understanding of the Church, is that Baptism, whereby really the *regeneration* and rebirth take place by which persons truly are united with Christ and are incorporated into him as the Head of Body of the Church. Therefore valid Baptism is required in order really to constitute members of the Body of the Church.

1035. Scholium 1. *What is the minimum requirement for someone to be a member of the Church?* There is a *threefold* main response to this question even among Catholic Theologians who hold that a member of the Church is a baptized person, who is not manifestly a heretic or a schismatic or someone perfectly excommunicated.

The first opinion of many authors with Bellarmine answers: The Church is a visible and juridical society of men, very much like the civil society. But a member of a visible and juridical society of men is someone in whom only the external conditions are fulfilled which are required legally. Therefore the minimum that is required and suffices to constitute a member of the Church is Baptism properly conferred, even if because of a defect of intention it is invalid, and therefore does not imprint on the soul the internal and invisible character.

Others respond: The Church is indeed a visible and juridical society, however it is one of reborn men (John 3:5); therefore just as for someone to be a citizen of civil so-

ciety his natural birth is pre-required, so also for someone to be a citizen of the Church his supernatural rebirth is pre-required. But his is not conferred truly and really by an invalid Baptism; and therefore by a Baptism merely correctly conferred he becomes a member of the Church only apparently and putatively, as Bellarmine himself concedes when he writes: "It could also be replied, and in a better way, that those who are not baptized and still are considered as baptized, are members of the Church only according to external appearances, that is, putatively but not truly."²⁷

1036. *The second opinion* of several theologians with Billot gives this answer: The Church is a society of regenerated men. But this supernal regeneration is not given except in a valid Baptism by which the character of regeneration is imprinted. Therefore the minimum that is required and suffices to constitute a member of the Church is valid Baptism by which the character is imprinted on the soul.

Others object: The character conferred by a valid Baptism does not suffice to constitute a member of the Church, because properly it is not the principle of spiritual life, and because the damned retain the received indelible character, but they are not even potentially members of the Church.²⁸

1037. *A third opinion of not a few authors answers with Suarez:* The Church is the society of the faithful, namely, of those who are united with Christ the Head through some act of the spiritual life. But the minimum that is required and suffices that the member of such a society be united with Christ the Head by an act of the spiritual life is faith. Therefore the minimum that is required and suffices to constitute a member of the Church is faith.

Others observe: Faith as an act of the spiritual life can be required in order to have a member of the Body of the living Church as living with some internal and supernatural life, but not in order to constitute a member of the visible Body of the Church as such, which is what we are now considering.

1038. Therefore the minimum that suffices to constitute a member of the Church is: *In the first opinion*, that he be a member *putatively*, and so he has the *right* by which he is considered *extrinsically* to be of the Church, although really he is *incapable* of participating in the internal life of the Body of the Church. *In the second opinion*, that he be a member *materially*, and so he has the *right* whereby *intrinsically* he is considered to be of the Church, so that really he is *capable* of participating in the internal life of the Body of the Church. *In the third opinion*, that he be a member *formally*, and so he has the *right* by which he is thought to be of the Church *effectively*, and so that *de facto* he participates to some extent in the internal life of the Body of the Church. In other words, for the nature of a member of the Church it suffices:

27. R. Bellarmine, *De Ecclesia milit.* L.3 c.10, fourth objection, response to the first: ed. Vivès, 2,343. See 1.3 c.2.

28. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.22; Bellarmine, *De Ecclesia milit.* 1.3 c.4.

In the first view, that he be like a branch not engrafted, but only adhering to the vine;

In the second view, that he be like a branch engrafted into the vine, although he remains dry;

In the third view, he be like a branch engrafted into the vine, and enjoying some of its juice.

1039. Scholium 2. *The mind of Theologians on the Church in the broad sense and in the strict sense.* St. Thomas speaks about the Church understood in this double sense.

1) *On the Church in the broad sense he teaches these points especially*²⁹:

a) "The body of the Church is made up of the men who have been from the beginning of the world until its end."

b) "The ancient Fathers, by observing the legal sacraments, were borne to Christ by the same faith and love whereby we also are borne to Him."

c) "Sinners are not members of Christ... except, perhaps, imperfectly, by formless faith, which unites to God relatively but not simply."

d) "Lifeless faith is common to all the members of the Church."

e) "The Church is united through faith."

f) "The Church on earth is the congregation of the faithful."

2) *St. Thomas holds this on the Church in the strict sense.*³⁰

a) "since Christ's coming, men are incorporated in Christ by faith; but faith in a thing already present is manifested by a different sign. But for this end is Baptism conferred on a man, that being regenerated thereby, he may be incorporated in Christ, by becoming his member."

b) "Through Baptism men are incorporated in Christ." This is like a basic principle which as such St. Thomas often assumes in his argument.

c) "Baptism is ordained to a certain spiritual regeneration, by which man becomes a member of Christ."

d) "If any were to be sanctified in the womb now, they would need to be baptized, in order to be conformed to Christ's other members by receiving the character."

e) "Adults who already believe in Christ are incorporated in him mentally. But afterwards, when they are baptized, they are incorporated in him corporally, as it were, i.e. by the visible sacrament, without the desire of which they could not have been incorporated in him even mentally." St. Thomas clearly teaches that the desire of Baptism, either explicit or implicit, is necessary.

29. S.Th.: a) III, q. 8, a. 3; b) III, q. 8, a.3 ad 3; c) III, q. 8, a. 3 ad 2; d) II-II, q. 4, a. 5 ad 4; e) II-II, q. 1, a. 9 ad 3; f) III, q. 8, a. 4 ad 2. On the Church in the broad sense see also St. Augustine, *Enarrat. In Psalm 90*, 2,1 (R 1479) and *De catech. rud.* C.3 n.61; c.19 n.33; ML 37,1159; 40,313.335; *De civ. Dei* 18,51,2: ML 41,614. See the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, On the Creed a.9 n.14; Y. Congar, *Ecclesia ab Abel*: Festschrift für Karl Adam (1952) p.79-108.

30. S.Th. a) III, q. 68, a. 1 co. and ad 1; b) III, q. 68, a. 4; a. 5 co. and ad 1; q. 69, a. 2 co. and ad 1; c) III, q. 62, a. 2; q. 69, a. 6; d) III, q. 68, a. 1 ad 3; e) III, q. 69, a. 5 ad 1; a. 4, ad 2. See I, q. 117, a. 2 ad 1.

1040. Suarez also speaks about the Church in the broad sense and in the strict sense.

1) *His main assertions about the Church in the broad sense are these*³¹:

a) "The Church began to be produced in Adam and Eve... Men on earth are the material part of the body of the Church... although not all, as is clear concerning pagans."

b) "It is the same Church before and after Christ... because the unity of faith in every stage of the Church has remained the same."

c) "Before justification a man can be united with Christ, but imperfectly and as a dead member," that is, through faith and hope.

d) "All who have faith are members of the Church, but those who lack it are outside the Church."

e) "Faith is the form that unites the members of the Church."

f) "The Church is the congregation of the faithful, or the moral body composed of the men who profess the true faith of Christ."

2) *Suarez teaches mainly these things about the Church in the strict sense*³²:

a) "The Council of Florence speaks about the Church according to its integral status, which it has from the institution of Christ, when it calls Baptism the spiritual door, for through it we are made members of Christ and of the body of the Church" (D 1314). "There is no one in this Church except a baptized person."

b) "Through Baptism we are made members of Christ and of the Church and capable of receiving the other sacraments." "A Baptized man is incorporated into Christ and the Church." "Baptism is given as the door to enter the Church of Christ and to participate in his other sacraments." These and similar statements express a basic principle from which Suarez often argues.

c) "Baptism makes man a member of Christ." "Baptism alone is regeneration in Christ and the door for entering the Church; and just as the Church is one, so there is only one way of regeneration."

d) "Through the baptismal character a man is sealed so that he may be a member of the Church and capable of the sacraments."

e) "Faith alone does not suffice for a catechumen to obtain grace, nor does contrition suffice for him unless it includes the desire of Baptism." "Baptism is necessary for all, because all need to be incorporated into Christ and to be sealed with his character." Furthermore, Suarez proves that the desire for Baptism, either explicit or implicit, is necessary for adults: "Some say that the proposition, "Outside of the Church there is no salvation," should be understood to be about the general Church, as it always was, and not about the Church alone, as it was specially instituted by Christ; but that response is not pleasing... Therefore this response is better: no one can be saved unless he enters this Church of Christ either actually or at least in desire... And

31. F. Suarez: a) *De fide* d.9 s.2 n.3; s.1 n.3 and 5; b) *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.18; s.4 n.6; c) *In 3* q.69 d.28 a.3 n.12; d) *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.5; e) *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.18 and 24; f) *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.3; s.2 n.3. On the Church from Abel, see Congar, *loc.cit.* note 29, and S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (1946) 122-128.

32. F. Suarez: a) *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.19 and see n.17; d.12 s.4 n.22; b) *In 3* d.26 s.2 n.8; d.27 s.1 n.8; d.11 s.1 n.7; c) *In 3* d.26 s.2 n.4; d.27 s.3 n.7; d) *In e* d.34 s.1 n.2; e) *In e* d.27 s.2 n.7.9f. Therefore it is certain that Suarez requires Baptism for a man to be a member of the Body of the Church which Christ instituted: *De fide* d.12 s.4 n.22. On what was done at Vatican I concerning the origin of the Church and its members, see J. Beumer, *Ekklesiologische Frage auf den Vatican*: MünchThZt 5 (1954) 236-245.

this is manifest, because no one is actually in this Church unless he is baptized, and so he can be saved; because just as the desire of Baptism suffices for him, so also the desire of entering the Church.”

1041. M. Cano can be well understood according to this distinction of the Church taken in a broader or more restricted sense, when he writes: “It should be understood that the Church can be understood in two ways. First, the one which the congregation composes of all the faithful from the beginning of the world unto its end, as St. Thomas says about the Church, and all those who say that it is now the same Church, which was among the Jewish people. In this sense, the Catechumens are true members of the Church, not by the sacrament of Baptism, but by faith, which at all times distinguished the people of God from the societies of unbelievers. Secondly, that also is said to be the Church which is brought together in the name of Christ through Baptism, which also is a sacrament of faith, and properly produces members and parts of the Church. Catechumens are not part of this Church, but all those are parts who have the character from the Baptism of Christ.” Molina also speaks about the Church in a broad sense.³³

1042. Objections.³⁴ 1. Before Baptism many have faith. But by faith they belong to the Church, which is the society of the faithful. Therefore Baptism is not required to constitute a member of the Church.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. Those who have faith and have it perfected by charity belong to the Church in desire, *conceded*; they belong to the Church actually, *I subdistinguish*: they belong actually to the Church in the broad sense, *I bypass that*; in the strict sense, that is, to that Church which was instituted by Christ on the Apostles, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Baptism actually received is not required to constitute a member of the Church in desire, *conceded*; to constitute a member of the Church actually, *I subdistinguish*: of the Church in the broad sense, *I bypass that*; in the strict sense, *denied*.

2. *The objector insists*: At least catechumens belong to the Church. Therefore at least for them Baptism is not necessary.

I distinguish the antecedent. Catechumens belong to the Church as its members, *denied*; as subjects of the Church, *I subdistinguish*: as subjects over whom the Church has jurisdiction, *denied*; as obligated to the Church, and because they submit themselves voluntarily to the conditions required in order to receive the Baptism of the Church, *conceded*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Baptism is not necessary for catechumens in order to be catechumens, *conceded*; in order for them to be subjects and members of the Church, *denied*.

1043. 3. “It is the same Church before and after Christ” (Suarez, *De fide*, d.9 s.1 n.18). But before the birth of Christ the members of the Church were constituted by

33. M. Cano, *De locis* l.4 c.2 answer to objections; L. Molina, *Concordia*, p.3 q.14 a.13 d.46 n.18, Ed. Jo. Rabenck (1953) p.283.

34. Kilber, n.91; De San, n.367-374; Van Laak, 187-193; Dorsch, 492-494; De Guibert, n.190.

faith alone. Therefore members of the Church are constituted not by Baptism but by faith alone.

I distinguish the major. The Church in the broader sense or understood spiritually, that is, concerning all those called by God to some kind of union with Christ whether in the future or when he had already come, *I bypass that*: the visible Church understood in the strict sense "according to the integral status which it has from the institution of Christ" (Suarez, *loc.cit.*, n.19), *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*

4. Not only spiritually but also visibly "the ancient Fathers (O.T.) belonged to the same body of the Church to which we also belong" (S.Th. III, q. 8, a. 3 ad 3). But the ancient Fathers belonged to the body of the Church through faith alone. Therefore Baptism is not required to constitute members of the body of the Church.

I distinguish the major. To the same body of the Church understood in the broader sense concerning those "who were borne to Christ by the same faith and love whereby we also are borne to Him" (S.Th., *loc. cit.*), *I bypass this*. Understood in the more strict sense about the supernatural and visible society instituted by Christ on the Apostles, so that "they are incorporated in him, as it were, corporally by the visible sacrament" (S.Th. III, q. 69, a. 5 ad 1), *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence.*

5. According to St. Paul, the body of the Church and the Mystical Body of Christ are adequately converted between one another (1 Cor. 12:27; Eph. 1:22f.; 4:4; 5:25-30). Therefore the members of the body of the Church are the same ones who are members of the Mystical Body. But according to St. Paul (Eph. 4:15f.; Col. 2:19) the members of the Mystical Body are all those who are united with Christ by some internal grace, that is, at least by the grace of faith, which Christ as the head pours into them. Therefore members of the body of the Church are all those who at least have internal faith, even though they have not received Baptism.

After conceding the antecedent and the first consequent, I distinguish the minor: the members of the Mystical Body are all those who are united with Christ by some grace conferred through the visible "joining together with which it is supplied" of the sacraments and ministers of the Church, as Paul says (Eph. 4:11-16), *conceded*. Through the bare internal grace of faith, *denied*.

1044. 6. Baptism as valid is invisible. Therefore Baptism as valid is not required to constitute a member of the visible Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Baptism in a reduplicative way as valid is invisible, *I bypass this*; Baptism in a specifying way which is valid is invisible, *I subdistinguish*: inadequately, *conceded*; adequately, *denied*.

7. *The objector insists*: That a Baptism, properly conferred on an infant, would be valid in a specifying way depends only on the intention of the Minister. But the intention of the Minister is adequately invisible. Therefore also the Baptism of an infant in a specifying way valid is adequately invisible.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. The intention of the Minister is

adequately invisible in a Baptism rightly conferred but invalid, *conceded*; in a Baptism rightly conferred but valid, *I subdistinguish*: the intention of the Minister is adequately invisible *per accidens* and immediately, *I bypass this*; per se and in a mediated way, *denied*.

In a Baptism *rightly and validly* conferred, the intention of the Minister in conferring the rite, which signifies what it produces, is so per se included in the human action itself of conferring the rite that in virtue of the same intention the external rite itself is performed; hence the intention of the Minister per se and indirectly is visible in the very rite posited by the human action; just as the mind of a speaker per se and indirectly becomes visible in his speaking, although *per accidens* and immediately it is invisible. But in both cases the visibility per se and indirectly suffices. "In the words uttered by him the intention of the Church is expressed and this suffices for the validity of the sacrament, unless the contrary is expressed on the part either of the minister or of the recipient of the sacrament" (S.Th. III, q, 64, a. 8 ad 20).

However, in a Baptism *rightly but invalidly conferred*, the invalidity depends only on the restrictive intention, whereby the Minister positively intends that the sensible sign not effect what it per se signifies. But this restrictive intention is *completely invisible*, and it happen only as a rare exception.

ARTICLE III

REASONS THAT SEPARATE A BAPTIZED PERSON FROM THE BODY OF THE CHURCH

Thesis 26. A heretic, apostate and schismatic by the fact itself; and a person excommunicated by legitimate authority are separated from the body of the Church.

1045. St. R. Bellarmine, *De Eccl. milit.* l.3 c.4-6; Franzelin, th.22-23; Wilmers, th.111-114; De San, n.338-344, 360-374; Straub, th.33-34; Muncunill, n.637-653; Billot, th.11-12; D'Herbigny, th.32; Dieckmann, n.960-961; Dorsch, p. 488-499; De Guibert, th.21; S. Fraghi, *De membris Ecclesiae* (1937); Stolz, p.27-34; Vellico, th.14; Journet, 2, p.1056-1081; Sauras, *El Cuerpo mistico* p.616-631; Zapelena, 2 (1954) 389-397; K. Rahner, *Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche nach der Encycl. "Mystici Corporis"*: *ZkathTh* 69 (1947) 129-188.

1046. Connection. In the preceding thesis we saw that Baptism constitutes members of the body of the Church. Now Baptism imprints an indelible character on the soul and so it cannot be repeated; hence the question is raised whether the reason for membership in the Church cannot be lost, or whether there are some reasons because of which baptized persons can be separated from the body of the Church. This thesis responds to this question.

1047. The notion of a *member* was already explained in the preceding thesis.

A *heretic* is someone who, after being baptized, obstinately denies or doubts one of the truths that must be believed by divine and Catholic faith.

An *apostate* is someone who, after being baptized, obstinately and totally abandons the Christian faith.¹ The same divisions which follow concerning a *heretic* also apply completely to the apostate.

A *material heretic* is someone who denies a truth that must be held by divine and Catholic faith, but he is such because of invincible ignorance or because of an error held in good faith. *Good faith* in an erring man is a prudent judgment whereby the one in error thinks that he does not err, but on the contrary, that he is in possession of the truth. A *formal heretic* is someone who denies a necessary truth out of vincible ignorance or from an error held out of bad or doubtful faith.

A *manifest heretic* is someone whose error or doubt in faith cannot be hidden by any excuse. But an *occult heretic* is said to be someone whose error or doubt in faith remains sufficiently hidden.

1. S.Th. II-II, q. 11, a. 2 ad 3; CIC 1325 § 2 [1917].

A *public heretic* is someone who openly adheres to some heretical sect. But a *private heretic* is a person who does not openly adhere to any heretical sect.

The same divisions and definitions can be applied to the *apostate*.

1048. A *schismatic* is someone who, after receiving Baptism, refuses to submit to the Supreme Pontiff or refuses to communicate with the members of the Church who acknowledge his supremacy.² A *schismatic* person can also be *material* or *formal*, *occult* or *manifest*, *private* or *public*. The definitions of these various types are the same as those we just gave about *heretics*, but by replacing the notion of a *heretic* with that of a *schismatic*.

1049. An *excommunication* is a censure or penalty whereby a delinquent or obstinate person is excluded from the communion of the faithful, until after abandoning his contumacy he is absolved. That can be called *formal* which affects a man who is really delinquent and obstinate. But that can be said to be merely *material*, which concerns a subject who through invincible error is thought to be delinquent and obstinate when in reality he is not such. It can be *total* or *partial* according as the excommunicated person is excluded from communion with the faithful in all or only in some of the good which fall under the jurisdiction of the Church. But the *internal* supernatural goods, such as sanctifying grace and the infused virtues, are not taken away by the censure itself. An excommunicated person is one who *must be avoided* (*vitandus*) who *by name* has been excluded from the communion of the faithful by the Apostolic See, and either by the law itself or by a public decree or sentence by name has been denounced as someone *who must be avoided*.³

We call that *excommunication perfect* whereby the Apostolic See properly intends to separate a delinquent and obstinate person from the body of the Church. Therefore, besides the privation of spiritual goods which fall under the jurisdiction of the Church, a *perfect* excommunication implies, as its own special nature, this *manifest intention* of separating someone from the body of the Church. But because the dominant intention of the Church is “to impose an excommunication for healing and not for ruin,”⁴ therefore, if by his contrition the excommunicated person recovers grace and charity, by that fact his excommunication ceases to be *perfect*, even though juridically he really remains *an excommunicated person to be avoided*, and he cannot *licitly* participate in the communion of the faithful

2. S.Th. II-II q. 39, a. 1; CIC 1325 § 2 [1917].

3. CIC 2241, 2257, 2258, 2343 § 1 n.1 [1917]; S.Th., 4 d.18 q.2; Suarez, *De censuris in communi*, d.8 s.1 n.177; F.X. Wernz, *Ius Decretalium* 6 n.145, 179-197.

4. S.Th., *Suppl.* Q. 23, a. 1; 4 d.18 q.2 a.4 sol.1.

until he is absolved.⁵

1050. We say deliberately that heretics, apostates, schismatics and the excommunicated of this kind *are separated* from union with the Church; thereby we wish to signify that heresy, apostasy, schism and excommunication are like *obstacles* that merely impede union. Wherefore if they are removed, then Baptism, with the efficacy that it possesses to incorporate men into the Church, by itself suffices to restore them to union.

1051. Adversaries. *In particular*, all schismatics and Protestants who adhere to the *three branch theory* of the Church, or defend the doctrines of the *Panchristians*, deny that heretics and schismatics are excluded from the body of the Church. For they, at best, recognize the necessity of Baptism; but besides that they hold that no conditions have been made in order to belong to the Church by which in any way the just freedom and the equal rights of the Churches are impeded. They call themselves Christians: "The Church is one," wrote Zankow, "and includes all those who have been baptized in Christ; but the divisions of the Churches do not go up to heaven."⁶ The *Irenists* belong here; we explained their opinion in n.1007.

1052. Opinions of the Theologians. Concerning some particular points and further questions, which occur in this matter with reference to the separation of the baptized from the Church, Catholic Theologians defend various opinions. For the sake of information, we will now mention the main ones.

1) That *formal and manifest heretics* are not members of the body of the Church can well be said to be the unanimous opinion among Catholics.

a) That formal heretics, but *occult*, are not members of the Church is defended by some authors, like Suarez, Molina, Billuart, Franzelin, Michelitsch, Stolz, Fraghi, Journet, Zapelena, and a few others. *But the contrary opinion is more common.*⁷

b) That *merely material* heretics, even if *manifest*, are members of the Church, is

5. According to St. Thomas, a *minor* excommunication is said to be that whereby the faithful "are separated only from participation in the sacraments"; but a *major* one is called that whereby the baptized are separated "both from participation in the sacraments and from the communion of the faithful": S.Th., 4 d.18 q.2 a.1 ad 1.

6. S. Zankow, *Das Othodoxe Christentum* 75f.: This expression: "The divisions of the Churches do not go up to heaven," he attributes to the Theologian and Metropolitan of Moskow, Philaretus. See F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* 227. See *Etudes oecuméniques, Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu* v.1-5 (1949). For more on the Panchristians, see n.1126f.

7. Occult heretics are excluded from the Church by: I. de Turrecremata, *Summa de Ecclesia* 1.4 part 2 c.18,3 via; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.5.13.18; L. Molina, *Concordia*, p.3 q.14 a.13 d.46 n.18; C.R. Billuart, *De regulis fidei* dis.3 a.2 § 4; I.B. Franzelin, th.23; A. Michelitsch, § 202; S. Fraghi, 90; A. Stolz, 32; Journet, 2, 1064; Zapelena, 2,389.

defended by Franzelin, De Groot, D'Herbigny, Caperan, Terrien, and a few others. But the contrary opinion is *more common*.⁸

1053. 2) That *formal and manifest schismatics* are not members of the Church is an almost unanimous opinion among Catholics.⁹

a) That formal but *occult* schismatics are members of the Church is generally conceded by Catholic authors.

b) That *merely material* and manifest schismatics are members of the Church is held by the authors who defend the same point concerning merely material and manifest heretics.

1054. 3) That those who have been excommunicated from the Church by a *perfect excommunication* are not members of the body of the Church is an opinion *common* among Catholics.

a) That the Church wishes indeed to punish by excommunication delinquent members, but de facto does not intend to separate the excommunicated from the body of the Church, although she says that they are to be avoided, is held by D'Herbigny, Dieckmann, Spacil, Sauras, with Báñez, Valentia, Suarez and Guarnieri.¹⁰

b) That those excommunicated *with a partial excommunication* are members of the Church is a common opinion among Theologians, who also generally hold that *merely material and occult* heretics and schismatics are members of the body of the Church.

1055. State of the question. We are considering the Church *in the strict sense*, that is, the Church which and inasmuch as she was instituted by Christ, and concerning those who not merely *putatively*, nor only *in desire*, but *in reality* have been constituted members of the Church through Baptism. We divide the thesis into two parts. *In the first part we say:* heretics, apostates and schismatics, who are *formal and manifest*, by that very fact are separated from the Church. *In the second part we hold:* those persons

8. Material heretics, even if manifest, are included in the Church by: Franzelin, th.23; J.V. de Groot, *De Ecclesia* q.3 a.3; D'Herbigny, n.355; L. Caperan, *Le problème du salut des infidels* (1912); J.B. Terrien, *La grâce et la gloire* 1 (1901) 330.

The following authors exclude material and manifest heretics from the Church: De San, n.359; Billot, th.11 p.296; Straub, n.1254; Muncunill, n.653; Van Noort, n.153; Zubizarreta, n.397; n.187; Fraghi, 85; Stolz, 31; Vellico, 540.

9. Formal and manifest heretics and schismatics are also excluded from the Church by: Kilber, n.90; Franzelin, th.23; Van Laak, 189-191; Van Noort, n.153f.; Mazzella, n.600-607; Tanquerey, n.903f.; Wilmers, n.397-400; Zubizarreta, n.399-403; Billot, th.12; Straub, n.1254-1268; Muncunill, n.6327-645; Michelitsch, § 201; D'Herbigny, th.32; Dieckmann, n.961; Schultes, a.12; De San, n.357f.; Felder, 44; Lercher, n.407-410; Fraghi, 81.101; Stolz, 30.33; Vellico, 540.545; Parente, 171; Calcagno, n.288.

10. D. Báñez, *In* 2.2 q.1 a.10; G. de Valentia, *De Fide* d.1 q.1 punct.7 § 14f.; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.5 and 14; A.F. Guarnieri, *De Ecclesia militante, Capite et membris eiusdem* l.1 c.9 (1694) 35-37; D'Herbigny, n.350.3; Dieckmann, n.960; T. Spacil, *De membris Ecclesiae*: "Bogoslovni Vestnik" 6 (1926) 13; M. Peña, ¿Pertenece los excomulgados a la Iglesia?: *RevEspT* 5 (1945) 121-132. To this opinion should be added: A. Gommenginger, *Bedeutet die Exkommunikation Verlust der Kirchengliedschaft?*: *ZkathTh* 73 (1951) 1-71, and E. Sauras, *El Cuerpo místico* (1952) 629-631

excommunicated *with a total, formal and perfect excommunication*, that is, for this purpose legitimately imposed, are also separated from the body of the Church.

Therefore here *we are not considering* the further questions, which are debated among Catholic authors, about heretics, apostates and schismatics who are merely material or occult; and we are not denying that those persons are members of the Church who have been punished only with an excommunication that is material or partial or imperfect.

1056. Doctrine of the Church. Part 1 is *implicitly defined* by the Council of Florence *in the Decree for the Jacobites*: D 1351. But concerning *heretics* and *apostates* we deduce our doctrine also from the formula of faith of the “Clemens Trinitas,” from canon 23 of Lateran Council II, and from the Bull of Pius IX “*Ineffabilis Deus*”: D 74, 718, 2804.

PART 2, in which we hold that those excommunicated with a perfect excommunication, which the Supreme Pontiff can decree, are separated from the body of the Church, is taught as *Catholic doctrine* by Pius XII in the *Encycl. “Mystici Corporis”*: AAS 35 (1943) 202f.

1057. Pius XII and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* openly teach our whole thesis.¹¹

Pius XII writes: “Only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of Baptism and profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom, for very grave crimes, by the legitimate authority... It follows that those who are divided from one another in faith or government cannot be living in one body so described, and by its one divine

Spirit... But the fact that the Body of the Church bears the august name of Christ must not lead anyone to suppose that, also during this time of its earthly pilgrimage, its membership is restricted to those who are eminent in sanctity, or that it is composed only of those whom God has predestined to eternal beatitude... Schism, heresy, or apostasy are such of their very nature that they sever a man from the Body of the Church; but not every sin, even the most grievous, is of such a kind.”

In the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* we read:

“There are three classes of persons excluded from the Church’s pale: infidels, heretics and schismatics, and excommunicated persons. Infidels are outside the Church because they never belonged to, and never knew the Church, and were never made partakers of any of her Sacraments. Heretics and schismatics are excluded from the Church, because they have separated from her and belong to her only as deserters belong to the

11. *Catechismus Concilii Tridentini* part 1 on the twelve articles of the Creed, a. 9 “I believe in the holy Catholic Church,” n.8, on who are not members of the Church; Pius XII, *Encycl. “Mystici Corporis”*: AAS 35 (1943) 201f.

army from which they have deserted. It is not, however, to be denied that they are still subject to the jurisdiction of the Church, inasmuch as they may be called before her tribunals, punished and anathematized. Finally, excommunicated persons are not member of the Church, because they have been cut off by her sentence from the number of her children and belong not to her communion until they repent. But with regard to the rest, however wicked and evil they may be, it is certain that they still belong to the Church.”

1058. Theological note. *The first part*, on heretics, apostates and schismatics, is *implicitly defined*, especially in the Council of Florence: D 1351. *The second part*, on persons excommunicated by a perfect excommunication, is *Catholic doctrine*, especially from the words of the Encyclical of Pius XII “*Mystici Corporis*,” which was just quoted.

1059. Proof. PART 1: Heretics, apostates and schismatics are not members of the Church.

It is proved by a general argument. The members of the visible Body of the Church are not those baptized persons, who formally and manifestly have broken the social bond of faith or government which was established by Christ as essential in his Church. But formal and manifest heretics, apostates and schismatics formally and manifestly have broken the social bond of faith and government established by Christ as essential in his Church. Therefore formal and manifest heretics, apostates and schismatics are not in reality members of the visible Body of the Church.

The major. a) The social bond of faith and government was established by Christ as essential in his Church, because it is necessarily included in powers of teaching and governing, which Christ established as essential in the Church, as was proved in thesis 3.

The major. b) Members of the visible Body of the Church in reality are not those who formally and manifestly have broken the essential social bond, because from the very nature of a society of men as such, those cease to be members of its body who formally and manifestly break an essential social bond.

The minor. It is certain from the definition of terms that formal and manifest heretics, apostates and schismatics formally and manifestly have broken the essential social bond of faith or government of the Church. Therefore they do not belong to the Church, which is the *Congregation of the faithful*, because schismatics are not *congregated* and heretics are not *faithful*.

1060. The same doctrine *is confirmed* by the authority of the testimonies of the holy Fathers.

a) *On heretics.* Tertullian: “If they are heretics, they cannot be Christians” (R 298).

St. Hilary: "I am a Catholic; I do not want to be a heretic. I am a Christian, not an Arian." St. Jerome: "Heretics have passed judgment on themselves, for by their own decision they have left the Church." St. Augustine: "You have cut yourself off from the members of the Church, you have cut yourself off from his Body. But what should I still say so that they separate themselves from the Church, since they have already done that? For they are heretics: now they are outside." The controversy about the re-baptism of heretics, which was actively debated since the middle of the 3rd century, supposed that it was known by all that heretics are outside the Church.¹²

b) *On schismatics*. St. Cyprian: "But what pertains to the person of Novatian... in the first place you know that we ought not to be curious about what he teaches, since he teaches outside. Whoever he is and whatever he is—he is not a Christian who is not in the Church of Christ... He did not possess fraternal charity nor ecclesiastical unity, and what he was formerly he has lost." St. Jerome: "Between heresy and schism we think there is this difference, namely, that heresy has perverse dogma; schism because of episcopal dissention separates from the Church... Moreover, there is no schism that does not include some heresy, so that it is rightly seen to be separated from the Church." St. Augustine: "Heretics and schismatics call their congregations churches. But heretics, in holding false opinions regarding God, do injury to the faith itself; while schismatics, on the other hand, in wicked separations break off from brotherly charity, although they may believe just what we believe. Wherefore neither to the heretics belong to the Church catholic, which loves God, nor do the schismatics form a part of the same, inasmuch as it loves the neighbor." St. Fulgentius: "Firmly hold and never doubt that every baptized person outside of the Catholic Church cannot share in eternal life, if before the end of his life he does not return and is incorporated into the Church. Most firmly hold and never doubt that not only all pagans but also all Jews, all heretics and schismatics who finish this life outside of the Catholic Church, will go into eternal fire, prepared for the devil and his angels" (R 2274, 2275). Pelagius I: "Do not pollute the always Catholic mind by association with schismatics. It is certain that there is only one Body of Christ, only one Church... our Savior decreed: a branch cut off from the vine is not good for anything except to be burned... And do not think that they can either be or be called the Church. For since, as we have already said, there is only one Church... it is certain that there is no other except what was founded radically on the apostles."¹³

1061. *Reason* recommends the same doctrine; for, if formal and manifest heretics and schismatics were members of the Body of the Church, that would be the end of the unity and uniqueness of the visible Church, which is repugnant. The Church is the *con-*

12. Tertullian, *De praescriptione* n.37: ML 2,50; St. Hilary, *Ad Constantium Augustum*: ML 10,558; St. Jerome, *In epist. ad Tit.* C.3 v.10: ML 26,598; St. Augustine, *Sermo* 181: ML 38,98; *De quaestione Baptismi hereticorum* see D 110f. with the notes, and R 308, 591, 593, 600, 16356, 2283; St. Ambrose: "Understand that all heretics and schismatics are separated from the Kingdom of God and from the Church," in Luke 11:24, 1.7 n.95: ML 15,1723.

13. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 55 *ad Antonianum* n.24: ed. Hartel: CSEL 3,642; St. Jerome, *in epist. ad Tit.* C.3 v.10: ML 26,598; St. Augustine, *De Fide et Symbolo* c.10 n.21: ML 40,193; St. Fulgentius, *De Fide ad Petrum* c.37f. n.78f.: ML 65,703f.; Pelagius I, *Epist. ad Ioan. Patricium*: ML 69,411.

gregation of the faithful: schismatics have ceased being *congregated* and heretics have ceased being *faithful*.

1062. Proof. PART 2: Excommunicated persons, namely those with a perfect excommunication, are not members of the Body of the Church.

a) *By right*. It is the law of the Church that those persons excommunicated by a perfect excommunication are not members of the Body of the Church. We deduce this from Matt. 18:15-18. For, from the immediate context it is clear that in this place the concern is especially with the correction of delinquent believers and also with the faculty given to the Church to separate the contumacious from the ecclesiastical community by a judicial sentence.¹⁴ Hence I argue in this way: In Matt. 18:18, with the power of binding and loosing there is given to the Church the right of separating contumacious sinners from the ecclesiastical community by a judicial sentence, in virtue of which they become like pagans and publicans. But a separation of this kind is a perfect excommunication whereby it happens that contumacious sinners are now not members of the Church. Therefore this is the right of the Church bringing it about that persons excommunicated by a perfect excommunication now are not members of the Church. *The major* is derived from an analysis of the text of Matt. 18:18 in the context of verses 18:15-18. *The minor* is clear, because if it happens by excommunication that sinners are like pagans and publicans, therefore in other words it happens that the same persons now are not members of the Church.

The same doctrine *is confirmed, as it were, a priori*. For, the right cannot be denied to the Church, which is a true and proper society of men, which belongs to every society of men, namely, of completely ejecting from the social Body delinquents, who present a serious danger to the common good of the members. But this is the right of excommunicating them by a perfect excommunication, whereby the Church decides to separate delinquents from her Body.

1063. b) *De facto*. Perfect excommunication *de facto* will be that in whose decree it is clearly certain that the Church really intends to separate the excommunicated person from its Body. For, as St. Thomas says, "Excommunication is a certain punishment and also a medicinal remedy."¹⁵ Indeed, *as a punishment* it supposes a true moral bond existing between the Church and the delinquent; *as medicinal*, however, it does not really intend the death, but rather the healing of the delinquent. Every excommunication has this character

14. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash I, Das Evang. nach Matth.* 16:19. See thesis 3, n.135f.

15. S.Th., *Suppl.* q. 22, a. 6 On the contrary; see H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.960; A. Gommenginger, *Bedeutet die Exkommunikation Verlust der Kirchengliedschaft?*: *ZkathTh* 73 (1951) 1-71.

of a *medicinal punishment*, according to the current law of the Church (see CIC 2257f., 2241 [1917]). It is certain that excommunication deprives every delinquent of the spiritual goods of the Church, and that it binds his soul not only externally, but also internally (ID 1473, 2646). However, since “the Church resorts to excommunication to repair and not to destroy,”¹⁶ therefore by its own nature not every excommunication separates from the Body of the Church. But *de facto* it can separate based on the intention of the Church, according to the right which we have proved that she has in order to do this.

De facto, therefore, one must carefully see whether the Church by an excommunication intends to eject the sinner from her own Body, or whether she intends only either to heal him as a sick person or punish him as a delinquent so that he will abandon his contumacy. It is necessary to say that a perfect excommunication *de facto* can be discerned, when from her decree it is clearly certain that the Church really intends to separate the excommunicated person from her own Body.

De facto this intention of the Church to separate the excommunicated from her own Body has been acknowledged often, as the following testimonies prove.

St. Cyprian: “The proud and contumacious are killed with a spiritual sword, when they are expelled from the Church. For they cannot live outside, since there is one House of the Lord and no one can be saved unless he is in the Church.” Origen: “God handed over delinquents into the hands of enemies not only through his Apostles, but also through those who preside in the Church, and have the power not only of loosing but also of binding; sinners are handed over for the ruin of the flesh when because of their crimes they are separated from the Body of the Church... and they are driven from the Church by the priests.” St. Ambrose: “Therefore the good Teacher... comes with a rod, because he removes the sinner from the sacred communion. And the one who is separated from the Body of Christ is well said to be handed over to Satan... For it is necessary to remove the grave sinner, lest a little leaven corrupt the whole mass.” St. Gregory: “You have nothing in common with him, but he is to be separated from your friendship and communion. For... it is better to expel the sick sheep from the Lord’s flock than to lose the healthy ones through the contagious disease of one.”¹⁷

1064. *De facto* this same intention of separating an excommunicated person from the Body of the Church seems to be included in the formulas of the greatest excommunications.

The Council of Orange I, in the year 441: “The method and form of excommunica-

16. S.Th., *Suppl.* q. 23, a. 1; 4 c.18 q.2 a.4 sol.1.

17. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 4, *ad Pomponium* n.4: ed. Hartel: CSEL 3,477; Origen, *In lib. iudic. homil.* 2 n.5: MG 12,961; St. Ambrose, *De Paenitentia* l.1 c.15 n.78f.: ML 16,510; St. Gregory I, *Epist.* 74 *ad Eusebium The-salon. Episcopum*: ML 77,121f.

tion... offenders against the Churches of God, by the authority of God and the judgment of the Holy Spirit, we eliminate from the bosom of Holy Mother Church and from association with all Christianity, until they repent and make satisfaction to the Church of God." St. Gregory VII: "We have excommunicated and separated from the bosom of the Holy Church... Stephen, a usurper and simoniac." "You have placed Silvius, the Doge, and the people of Venice... outside of communion with the members of Christ and the Church, because they seek and receive those who have been excommunicated for their crimes." *The Roman Pontifical*: After citing Matt. 18:18; 1 Cor. 5:11-13; 2 John 10f., it goes on to say: "Therefore, fulfilling the precepts of the Lord and the Apostles, with the sword of excommunication we cut off from the Body of the Church a rotten and incurable member, which does not accept any medicine, lest the other members of the Body be infected with a contagious disease like a poison... Therefore we separate him with all his associates and supporters, by the judgment of almighty God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and of blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and of all the saints, and also by the authority and power of Our lowness of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth, conferred upon us by God—we separate him from the precious reception of the Body and Blood of the Lord, and from the society of all Christians; and we exclude him from the domain of holy mother Church in heaven and on earth, and we decree that he is excommunicated and anathematized; and we declare him to be damned with the devil and his angels and all the reprobate in eternal fire; until he is freed from the snares of the devil, and returns to amendment and penance, and he makes satisfaction to the Church which he has damaged; we turn him over to Satan for the ruin of his flesh, in order that his spirit may be saved in the day of judgment (1 Cor. 5:5)."¹⁸

Explicit decrees of the Supreme Pontiff in which an excommunication is given expressly: Pius X: "Concerning the named Priests... by the authority of almighty God we excommunicate, anathematize and consider them separated from the communion of the Church and to be held as schismatics and we command and solemnly declare that they are to be avoided by all Catholics." Under Pius XI, the *Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office* decreed: "at the express command of His Holiness and by divine Providence Pope, Pius XI, he solemnly declares and decrees that the before mentioned priests ... by name and personally have incurred excommunication, are expelled from the bosom of the holy Church of God, are bound publicly with all the punishment of the excommunicated, and must be avoided by all the faithful."¹⁹

1065. Scholium. *The nature of a subject differs from the nature of a member of the Church.*

A baptized person always remains a subject of the Church, according to the precept of CIC cn.87 [1917], as is concluded from the teaching of St. Thomas: "Since the baptismal character whereby a man is numbered among God's people, is indelible, one who is baptized always belongs to the Church in some way, so that the Church is always

18. *Conc. Arausicanum* I: Msi 6,441; St. Gregory VII, *Epist.* 18 *ad Canonicos aniciensenses*: ML 148,472; *Epist.* 27 *ad Domn. Silvium Ducem et populum Venetiae*: ML 148,483; *Pontificale Romanum, Ordo excommunicandi* 3, *Anathema seu sollemnis excommunicatio pro gravioribus culpis*.

19. Pius X: AAS 3 (1911) 54; Pius XI: AAS 14 (1922) 593.

competent to sit in judgment on him.”²⁰ However, a baptized person who is a heretic or apostate or schismatic or excommunicated, as was proved in the thesis, cannot be said simply to be a *member* of the Body of the Church. Wherefore the nature of a subject of the Church differs from the nature of a member of the Body of the Church; and so it can be concluded rightly with Heribertus, Bishop of the region of Emelia in the 11th century: “The whole holy universal Church is indeed one Body, under Christ Jesus, that is, the one constituted as its Head... And just as there is one soul, which gives life to the various members of the body, so also the one Holy Spirit nourishes and enlightens the whole Church... That is the Body outside of which the Spirit does not vivify... A heretic does not live from this Spirit, the schismatic does not live from it, the excommunicated person does not live from it; for they are not part of the Body. But the Church has the vivifying Spirit, because it clings inseparably to Christ its Head.”²¹

1066. Objections. 1. Heretics, schismatics and any excommunicated persons are always subject to the judgment of the Church (CIC 87 [1917]). But only those who are within the Church are subject to the judgment of the Church (D 1671-1672). Therefore heretics, schismatics and excommunicated persons are members of the Church.

I distinguish the major. They are subject to the judgment of the Church because they always remain subjects of the Church, *conceded*; because they are members of the Church, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Only those who are subjects of the Church are subject to the judgment of the Church, *conceded*; only those who are members of the Church, *denied*. For all those who are members of the Church are also subjects of the same Church; but not all subjects of the Church are by that fact members of the Church.

2. From Matt. 13:24-30 with Matt. 13:36-41; from 2 Tim. 2:20; from 1 Cor. 3:11-17; from 1 Cor. 15:12 and from other texts of Scripture, some, relying on the interpretations of some of the holy Fathers, try to infer that heretics and schismatics, according to these testimonies of Scripture, are members of the Body of the Church.

However, from the obvious meaning of the texts and contexts, in the cited places, either the text is not referring to formal and manifest heretics and schismatics, or it is not stated precisely that they are *members* of the Church according as the nature of a member differs from the nature of a *subject* of the Church, or it is not speaking about the Church in the strict sense according as it is a visible social Body.

1067. 3. At least during the so-called *Western Schism* (1378-1417), there were factions or schismatic sects, several of which belonged to the same Church of Christ. Therefore schism does not *ipso facto* separate from the body of the Church.

Response. I deny the supposition, namely, that it was a schism separating people from the Body of the Church. For, during those controversies, when all were trying to discover who in fact really was the legitimate successor of St. Peter so that all might

20. S.Th., *Suppl.* q. 22, a. 6 ad 1. See CIC 87.

21. The “*Expositio in septem Psalmos paenitentiales*” were attributed to St. Gregory I (ML 79,602), but it seems that their author was Heribertus, according to A. Mercati, *L'autore della "Expositio in septem Psalmos paenit."*: RevBén 31 (1914-1919) 250-257. See O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* 5 (1932) 299.

give him the obedience due to him, there was no *formal schism* or one coming from an attitude of secession; in fact there was not even a *material schism in the proper sense*, as we shall explain at length in the scholium attached to thesis 31, n.1278-1283.

4. A formal and manifest schismatic, who is not formally a heretic, can be united to Christ with faith, informed hope, with the sorrow of attrition and with beginning love. But with these supernatural principles a man actually is united with the mystical Body of Christ. Therefore, a formal and manifest schismatic is not by that fact separated from the body of the Church.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. With such supernatural principles a man is united to the mystical Body of Christ; in him there is no break from the three essential bonds of faith, of government and of sacred communion, whereby members as such are united to the Head in the mystical Body, *conceded*. A man in whom something is broken from the three essential bonds whereby members as such are united in the mystical Body, *denied*. And because of these distinctions the consequent and the consequence *are denied*.

5. An excommunicated man to be avoided, who is not formally a heretic or schismatic, can be perfectly united to Christ also with grace and charity.²² But a baptized man who is perfectly united to Christ also with grace and charity is actually a member of the mystical Body or of the Church. Therefore an excommunicated man also who must be avoided is not really separated from the Body of the Church.

I distinguish the major. Someone excommunicated with an excommunication that is partial, or merely material, or imperfect can be perfectly united to Christ with grace and charity, *conceded*; with an excommunication that is total, formal and perfect, *denied*. *The minor* is conceded; likewise, the consequent is distinguished like the major and the consequence is denied.

22. See E. Sauras, *El Cuerpo místico* (1952) 629-631.

ARTICLE IV

HOLINESS AND PREDESTINATION ARE NOT OF THE NATURE OF MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH

Thesis 27. Neither all nor only the predestined and justified are members of the Body of the Church.

1068. St. R. Bellarmine, *De Ecclesia militante* l.3 c.7-9; F. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.1 n.6-12; Billot, *De Ecclesia* th.13; D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.346; Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* Ass.28f.; De Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.176; Lercher-Schlaginhaufen, th.39; A. Stolz, *De Ecclesia* c.3; Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.12; S. Fraghi, *De membris Ecclesiae* c.2.

1069. Connection. We proved in theses 25 and 26 that men are constituted members of the Body of Christ by Baptism; however, they are not members absolutely but only hypothetically, namely, unless the baptized either on their own part for heresy or schism exclude themselves from the Body of the Church, or on the part of the Church they are excluded by a perfect excommunication. Now we ask whether or not on the part of God something further is required. The faithful are well called by St. Peter *a chosen race, a holy nation* (1 Pet. 2:9)—a statement which Protestants have interpreted falsely. Wherefore in the thesis we assert against them that predestination and holiness are neither required nor sufficient to constitute members of the Body of the Church.

1070. Definition of terms. The *predestined* are those who from eternity have been destined by God for eternal life, and at some time they will actually obtain it.

The *justified* are those who actually are found to be in the state of sanctifying grace.

1071. State of the question. Not all, whether the predestined or the justified, are members of the Church. With this first assertion we are saying that there can be predestined and justified, who nevertheless are not members of the Body of the Church; therefore, that predestination and justification do not suffice to constitute members of the Body of the Church.

Not both the predestined and the justified alone are members of the Church. With this second assertion we are saying that there can be some who are not predestined and are sinners, who nevertheless are members of the Body of the Church; therefore, that predestination and justification are not required to constitute members of the Body of the Church.

1072. Adversaries. A. That members of the Church are constituted by *predestination* alone is held by John Wycliffe, who said that “a member of the devil is known beforehand”: D 1158, and in his treatise *On the Church* he defended this thesis: “the Church according to its earthly part does not have any foreknown part of itself, just as it does not have it according to its triumphant part.”¹ John Hus taught the same error: “There is only one holy universal Church, which is the totality of the predestined,” and again “the part of the holy Church is never foreknown; and the predestined person always remains a member of the Church”: D 1201-1203, 1205f.1221. Calvin and the *Calvinists*: “What is the Church? The Body and society of the faithful whom God has predestined for eternal life.”²

1073. B. That *holiness* or justification is a necessary condition for men to be members of the Body of the Church was asserted by many rigorists and pessimists *since the 2nd century*. *Montanists* recognized only their “Church of the Spirit” as the true Church of Christ, which consisted of members distinguished for their moral integrity, but they denied that the Church has power over sinners guilty of more serious crimes: R 385-387. *In the 3rd century* the *Novatians* called themselves *Cathars* or the pure ones, and they rejected the Church of those who admitted lapsed sinners to repentance.³ From the 4th century the Donatists taught that the true Church is not “the one which now has evil persons together with the good”: R 1714; and therefore St. Optatus refuted the Donatist, Parmenianus, when he said:

“You have said that the Church exists among you alone, because you strive in your pride to vindicate for yourself a special kind of holiness, that where you wish—there is the Church, and it is not where you do not want it to be. Therefore, in a part of Africa, in the corner of a small region, it can be among you; but among us in other parts of Africa it does not exist?”⁴

In the 5th century the *Pelagians* held similar views, saying:

“that the life of the just in this world is absolutely free of sin, and that in this mortal life the Church of Christ is made perfect from these... as if that is not the Church of Christ which throughout the whole world cries out to God: *Forgive us our trespasses*”: R 1976.

1. J. Wycliffe, *De Ecclesia* I: ed. Loserth (1880) 3.

2. J. Calvin, *Catechismus Ecclesiae genevensis*: ed. K. Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* 125.

3. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.6 c.43: MG 20,616.

4. St. Optatus Milevitanus, *De Schismate Donatistarum adversus Parmenianum* 1.2 c.1: ML 11,941f.: ed. C. Ziwsa: CSEL 26,32-33.

1074. *In the Middle Ages*, namely in the 13th century, the *Waldensians*, reviving the Catharism of Novatian, said that the administration of the sacraments could be done only by saints, even if they are not ordained priests, and they refused to communicate with sinners, even if they had truly repented: D 793-794. *In the 14th century the Fraticelli* propagated the errors of the Donatists about the sanctity of the members of the Church: D 911-912.

In the 16th century Luther embraced doctrines of this kind, writing as follows:

"Faith names the holy Church of Christians as the Communion of Saints... that is, a communion of such a nature that only saints are found... I believe that on earth there is a certain small congregation of Saints and a communion made up of holy men, under one Head, Christ, brought together by the Holy Spirit, in one faith, with the same meaning and judgment, endowed with multiple gifts, but unanimous in love and harmonious in all things, without sects and schisms. Constantly I believe that I also am a part and member of them." *The Augustinian Confession* professes ideas similar to these.⁵

1075. *At the end of the 17th century* the Jansenist, Paschasius Quesnel, taught similar views:

"The Church or the whole Christ has the incarnate Word as its Head, but all the saints as members." "There is nothing larger than the Church of God: because all the chosen and justified of all times compose it": D 2472-2478.

In addition to the above, there is the *Synod of Pistoia in the 18th century*, who taught that only those belong to the Body of the Church who are "perfect adorers in spirit and in truth": D 2615.

In our time to these can be added those whom Pius XII in the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis"* reprimanded with a grave censure, when he wrote:

"We therefore deplore and condemn also the calamitous error which invents an imaginary Church, a society nurtured and shaped by charity, with which it disparagingly contrasts another society which it calls judicial. But the introduction of this distinction is completely false" (AAS 35,224).

1076. Doctrine of the Church. It can be deduced from the words just quoted of Pius XII, to which should be added also what we read in the same *Encyclical*:

5. Luther, *Catechismus maior*: ed. Müller-Kolbe, *Symbolische Bücher der evang. luther. Kirche* 456f.; *Confessio Augustana* a.74; *Apologia Confessionis Augustanae*: ed. Müller-Kolbe, *loc.cit.*, 40,152. See M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.60.

“But the fact that the Body of the Church bears the august name of Christ must not lead anyone to suppose that, also during its time of its earthly pilgrimage, its membership is restricted to those who are eminent in sanctity, or that it is composed only of those whom God has predestined to eternal beatitude” (AAS 35,203)

Vatican Council I in its Outline 1 of the *Constitution on the Church* proposed:

“The whole Body of the Church is visible, and to it belong not only the justified or the predestined, but also sinners, but joined to her with a profession of faith and communion.” But this doctrine was indeed proposed with a grave censure as it was defined in Outline 2 of the *Constitution on the Church* of the same Vatican Council: “Those have wandered far away from the true faith who contend that the Church of the faithful is not an external society, but an invisible society of the justified or the predestined.” To this manifest doctrine contained in the chapters is added “cannon 4: If any one says that the Church, to which the divine promises were made, is not an external and visible society of the faithful, but a spiritual society of the predestined or justified which is known only by God, let him be anathema.”⁶

1077. Theological note. The doctrine of the thesis, from the condemnations of John Hus: D 1201-1203, 1205f., 1221, of the Protestants: D 1578, and of the Synod of Pistoia: D 2615, must be said to be at least *theologically certain*; from the prepared decrees of *Vatican Council I* it is *proximate to defined faith*.

1078. Proof. 1) By a general argument: *If all and only* both the predestined and the justified were members of the Body of the Church, the Church would be completely invisible to us. But with arguments independent of this thesis we will prove that the Church is also definitely visible: thesis 28. Therefore neither all nor only both the predestined and the justified are members of the Body of the Church.

The major is clear, because with absolute certitude we cannot know who in the Church are predestined, who are justified, as is known from the teaching of the *Council of Trent*: D 1533-1534, 1540f., 1565f. Therefore if only the predestined or only the justified were members of the Body of the Church, we would surely not be able to know who the faithful of the Church are, or who are the Pastors, and therefore the Church would be completely invisible to us, and obedience could not be demanded of anyone as one of the faithful, nor could any attribute to themselves the right to govern as true Pastors.

6. *Conc. Vaticanum, Constitutio de Ecclesia* Schema I c.4: Msi 51,541; Schema 2 c.5 and cn.4: Msi 53,311f.316.

1079. Proof. 2) By particular arguments. A. *Not all*, whether predestined or justified, are members of the Body of the Church. For, Baptism actually received is required for someone to be a member of the Church, as we proved in thesis 15. But not all either of the predestined or the justified actually have received Baptism. Therefore not all the predestined or justified are members of the Body of the Church.

The minor is clear: a) *Concerning the predestined*, because they are such from eternity, but they receive Baptism actually in time; therefore before they have received Baptism the predestined are not members of the Body of the Church. *The minor is clear:* b) *Concerning the justified*, because before they have actually received Baptism many men in every age were able to obtain and therefore without doubt did obtain justification through acts of charity or perfect contrition, as can be deduced easily from 1 John 4:7.16; Rom. 13:9f.; Matt. 22:37-40; see D 1931-1933, 1970f.

1080. B. *Not only* the predestined or the justified are members of the Body of the Church. For Christ openly taught that there are sinners in the Church mixed together with the justified, and at the end they are to be condemned, as can easily be proved from the parables of the net: Matt. 13:47-50, from the wedding feast: Matt. 22:2-14, and from the virgins: Matt. 25:1-13; therefore there are in the Church also the foreknown and sinners; and so not only the predestined or the justified are members of the Body of the Church.

1081. C. *In particular*, that sinners are numbered among the members of the Body of the Church is necessarily included in the fact that Christ instituted the Sacrament of Penance to forgive the sins of the members of the faithful, as is concluded from John 20:23 and from the *Council of Trent*: D 1668f. St. Paul clearly supposed the same thing when he reprehended sinners who belong to the Church, as is certain from 1 Cor. 5:1-5.12. Moreover, the same supposition is clear from the understanding of the Church, which in all ages has claimed for herself the right of imposing salutary penances on the faithful who are sinners and of reconciling them; the Church has zealously defended and constantly exercised this as her own proper right against all those who have attacked it.

1082. D. St. Gregory I in a homiletic commentary on the parable of the wedding feast gave expression, eagerly and with great clarity, to the certain mind of the Church concerning this matter, Matt. 22:1-13:

"By the quality itself of the wedding guests it is clearly shown that through these nuptials of the King the present Church is designated, in which the evil live together with the good... For as long as we live, it is necessary that we continue on the road of this life mixed together. But we will be judged when we arrive. For the good alone are nowhere but in heaven; and the evil alone are nowhere but in hell... In this Church, therefore, neither the evil can be without the good, nor the good without the evil... But it should not terrify you that in the Church there are many evil persons and few good... because in the holy Church the more holy some are, by the same measure there are fewer... From this a general principle is drawn which says: *Many are called but few are chosen*. What we have heard is very terrifying. Behold, all of us now have been called through faith to the nuptials of the heavenly King; we both believe and confess the mystery of his incarnation, and we take the food of the divine Word; but on a future day the King of judgment is going to come. That we have been called, we know; if we have been chosen, we do not know."

1083. Objections.⁸ 1. From John 10:27-28: *My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give them eternal life, and they shall never perish, and no one shall snatch them out of my hand.*

Hence the objection: Christ's sheep are members of the Body of the Church. But Christ's sheep are those to whom Christ gives eternal life and who will never perish. Therefore members of the Body of the Church are those who will obtain eternal life and will never perish, that is, they are predestined.

I admit the text and I comment: In that text the sheep of Christ are called those who hear his voice and follow him. Surely eternal life is promised to them, however not absolutely, but under this condition which Christ himself often expressed: *He who endures to the end will be saved*: Matt. 10:22; 24:13.

Answer to the objection: I bypass the major and distinguish the minor. Christ's sheep are those who hear his voice and follow him, and to them Christ promises eternal life, if they persevere to the end in obedience and in following him, that is, in his Church, *conceded*; Christ's sheep are all and only the predestined to whom Christ promises eternal life as absolutely future, *denied*. Likewise I distinguish the consequent. The members of the Body of the Church are all and only the predestined to whom Christ promises eternal life as absolutely future, *denied*; the members of the Body of Christ are those who hear the voice of Christ and follow him, and to whom Christ promises eternal life, if they persevere to the end in obedience and in following him, that is, in his Church, *conceded*.

1084. 2. From Eph. 5:23: *Christ is the Head of the Church, and is himself the Savior of his Body.*

Hence they object: The Body of the Church is constituted by those who will obtain eternal salvation. But these are only the predestined. Therefore the Body of the Church

7. St. Gregory I, *Homiliae in Evangelia* l.2 homil.38 n.7f. 14: ML 76,1285-1290.

8. See I. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.631-636; H. van Laak, *Repetitorium* ((1911) 194-196.

is constituted by the predestined alone.

I admit the text and I comment: In it Christ is called the Savior of the Body of the Church, since, as its Head, he exercises towards the members of his Mystical Body salutary functions similar to those which a man's head exercises on the members of the human body; and this remains true even if some members are lost, notwithstanding the salutary influence of the head.

Response: I distinguish the major. The Body of the Church is constituted by those who, having been incorporated into Christ by Baptism receive salutary influence from him as from the Head of the Mystical Body, *conceded*; the Body of the Church is constituted by those who are not incorporated into Christ by Baptism and only because of an implicit desire of belonging to the Church will obtain from God eternal life, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Only the predestined are those who from eternity, having been preordained by God for eternal salvation, will de facto obtain it, *conceded*; only the predestined are those who, having been incorporated into Christ by Baptism, receive salutary influence from him as the Head of the Mystical Body, *denied*.

1085. 3. From Heb. 3:6: *Christ was faithful over God's house as a son. And we are his house if we hold fast our confidence and pride in our hope.*

Hence they argue: to the house of God, that is, to the Church, belong those who persevere to the end. But such are the predestined. Therefore the Church is constituted by the predestined alone.

I distinguish the major. The baptized belong to the Church as long as they remain faithful to Christ and retain the hope of eternal life, *conceded*; the non-baptized also belong to the Church, who de facto are going to obtain eternal life, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

1086. 4. From Eph. 5:25-27: *Christ loved the Church and gave himself up for her, that he might sanctify her, having cleansed her by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the Church to himself in splendor, without spot or wrinkle..., that she might be holy and without blemish.*

Hence they object: The Church of Christ is holy and immaculate, without spot or wrinkle. But to such a Church only saints can belong. Therefore the members of the Church are only the saints.

I distinguish the major. The triumphant Church is absolutely holy and immaculate, *conceded*; the Church militant, *I subdistinguish:* it is absolutely holy on the part of the Head and the Soul, that is, Christ and the Holy Spirit, and also on the part of its divine institutions, *conceded*; on the part of its members, *again I subdistinguish:* inasmuch as this depends on the will and intention of Christ, *conceded*; inasmuch as this depends on the cooperation of men, *again I subdistinguish:* in many members, *conceded*; in all of its members, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

ARTICLE V

THE NECESSITY OF THE CHURCH FOR SALVATION

Thesis 28. The Church is necessary for all to obtain eternal salvation, also with a necessity of means.

1087. S.Th. III, a. 73, a. 3; q. 68, a. 1 and 2; St. R. Bellarmine, *Controv.* l.3, de *Ecclesia* c.3; Franzelin, th.24; Palmieri, p.15; Straub, n.345; D'Herbigny, n.85-91; Dorsch, 539; Zapelena, th.23; De Guibert, n.194; Muncunill, n.323; Schultes, 268; Bainvel, 89; Lercher, n.432; Dublanchy, *Eglise*: DTC 2155-75; Capéran, *Le problème du salut des infidèles* (1934); Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 (1951) 1081-1114; *Le salut hors de l'Eglise*: LumVie 18 (1954).

1088. Connection. We have proved firstly, in thesis 3, that the Church of Christ is obligatory for all; secondly, in thesis 22, that the end or purpose of the Church is the supernatural salvation of men; thirdly, in thesis 27, that the saints are not the only members of the Body of the Church. Wherefore now we inquire further into the nature of the necessity of belonging to the Church in order to obtain salvation. We say that it is a necessity not only of precept, but also of means.

1089. Definition of terms. *The Church* is that visible society instituted by Christ, about which we are treating.

Necessary for salvation is that without which salvation cannot be obtained.

Necessary with a necessity of precept, in virtue of the word, is that which is required for the necessary fulfillment of a precept so that the end can be obtained.

Therefore, *with a necessity of precept* that is necessary for salvation, the *culpable* omission of which hinders the obtaining of salvation. Therefore that which hinders the obtaining of salvation is the *fault which he incurs* who transgresses the precept.

Hence this necessity *is given only for a subject* in order to fulfill the precept: 1) *who is capable*: therefore only for an adult, who alone is capable of incurring the guilt; 2) *who is fit*: therefore for someone who knows that it is commanded and can fulfill the precept; 3) *who is responsible*: therefore for someone who legally is not either excused or dispensed.

1090. *Necessary with a necessity of means, in virtue of the word*, is that which is required because it is necessary to use the means, on which the obtaining of the end depends *positively* and *necessarily*.

With a necessity of means, therefore, that is necessary for salvation on

which the obtaining of the end depends *either as a cause or as a condition without which it cannot be obtained*.¹

Therefore this necessity of means *is given for every subject*; and the following do not excuse from it: 1) *the incapacity* of a human act; therefore it applies both to children and to adults; 2) *unfitness*; therefore it binds those to use this medium who know about it and can use it and those who are ignorant of it and cannot use it; 3) *irresponsibility*; therefore it requires the use of the means both from someone who culpably omits it and from someone who inculpably omits it.

1091. Therefore *with a necessity of means* that is *necessary* for salvation because of which, *even if it is omitted inculpably*, salvation cannot be obtained. This notion is admitted generally.

Necessary with a necessity of means is said to be that which either *absolutely or actually*, or *disjunctively*, that is, *either actually or in desire*:

1) *Necessary actually* is that means, which in no way can be replaced;

2) *Necessary either actually or in desire* is that means which, since it cannot be had actually, can be supplied for by something else (for example, charity or martyrdom) joined together with the will to use the means. Such will is called a *desire*, which can be had in two ways: a) *explicit*, as the will of the act; b) *implicit*, according as it is rightly thought to be included in the act of charity or martyrdom. Baptism of desire and of blood “are called Baptism because *they take the place of Baptism of water*” (III, q. 66, a. 11). “Contrition takes the place of Baptism” (III, q. 68, a. 3).

Finally, *a necessity of means* can take place in two ways: 1) *from the nature of the matter*, if the connection, whereby the end depends on the means, flows from the nature of things; b) *from a positive direction*, if such a connection is established by the will of the person who has the power to introduce it.

1. Several Theologians hold *on the nature of a necessary means* in order to obtain some effect that it is a cause *positively influencing* the effect: thus Franzelin, th.24 p.432; Van Laak, *Instit. Theol. Fundam.*, de Ecclesia 197; Bainvel, *De Ecclesia* 89; De Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.194; Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (19400 th.22. But other Theologians think that the necessary means for salvation is said to be that which either by way of a cause influences salvation or *as a condition previous to salvation is required positively*: thus Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.346; Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 540; Lercher, n.432 to whom it seems can be added Zapelena, *loc.cit.* Finally, other Theologians refrain from making this further determination: thus Palmieri, *Prolegomena de Ecclesia* § 7; Ottiger, *De Ecclesia* 263; D’Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.86; Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.956. On the concept of a necessity of means among the Scholastics, see J.A. de Aldama, *La necesidad de medio en la Escolastica postridentina*: ArchTG 8 (1945) 57-84.

1092. State of the question. We are saying that the Church is necessary for all to obtain salvation, *not only with a necessity of precept, but also of means*; however, not from the nature of the case, but from a positive institution of God; and also we affirm the necessity not in actuality, but at least in desire, which we do not require to be explicit, but we say that an implicit desire is sufficient.

1093. Adversaries. 1) Defenders of religious *indifferentism*, who say that for salvation moral uprightness joined with any kind of faith is sufficient for salvation (D 2865-2867).

2) Defenders of the *three branch theory of the Church* (D 2885), who hold that both Catholics and Schismatic Orientals and Anglicans can be saved in exactly the same way.

3) Promoters of *Panchristianity* (D 2199 [34.ed]), who say that all those who belong to any of the Christian confessions can equally obtain salvation.²

Vatican Council I intended to condemn these adversaries, among whom was the Calvinist in the 17th century, Jurieu, because he was a promoter of these errors.³

4) *Oriental schismatics*, who are not infected with the three errors just cited above, interpret sufficiently well the stated principle: "Outside of the Church there is not salvation" [*Extra Ecclesiam non est salus*].⁴ Strictly, therefore, Schismatics as such are not adversaries. On the interpretation of the same principle in the various Protestant confessions, see D'Herbigny.⁵

5) Contemporary *Irenists*, thinking that the doctrine of the necessity of the Church is an obstacle to the establishment of fraternal unity of all Christians, distinguish the Church inasmuch as it is a *social Body* from the Church inasmuch as it is the *Mystical Body*, and they hold, that to obtain salvation it is sufficient that a person belongs to the *Mystical Body*. Hence they conclude that other Christians, although under the social aspect they are separated from Catholics, nevertheless really are members of the *Mystical Body*, and that nothing prevents Catholics from embracing them as brothers in Christ and from establishing with them a certain true union

2. Pius XI, *Encycl. "Mortalium animos"*: AAS 20 (1928) 5-16.

3. Msi 53,312. P. Jurieu, *Le vrai système de l'Eglise et la véritable analyse de la foi* (Dordrecht 1686) 54.79.141.561. See Msi 51,566-568.

4. M. Jugie, *Theol. Christ. Orient.* 4, *De Ecclesia* 316-319. But. S. Zankow contradicts him, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum des Ostens* 77.

5. M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.89,2.

of Churches.⁶ Pius XII laments because “some reduce the necessity of belonging to the true Church, so that eternal salvation may be obtained, to an empty formula” (D 3867) and he says: “Many in the oriental regions have miserably abandoned the unity of the Mystical Body of Christ for many centuries” (AAS 43 [1951] 640f.).

6) Leonard Feeney and his followers who hold that a *desire* for salvation does not suffice, but that it is required to be *actually* a member of the Church.⁷

1094. The doctrine of the Church is certain: From *the Profession of faith Prescribed for the Waldensians* under Innocent III, in the year 1208: D 792. “Outside of the one, holy, Roman, catholic Church we believe that no one is saved.”

From *Lateran Council IV*, under the same Innocent III in 1215, against the *Albigensians*: D 802: “There is indeed one universal Church of the faithful outside of which no one at all is saved.”

From Boniface VIII in the *Bull “Unam sanctam”* in the year 1302: D 870-872. Read it carefully and note the classical image of the ark of Noah, whereby the necessity of means is aptly signified.

From *the Council of Florence*, under Eugene IV in the year 1442, in its Decree for the Jacobites: D 1351: “No one can be saved unless he remains in the bosom and unity of the Catholic Church.”

From Pius IX against *indifferentism*: D 2865, 2865-2867, 2917, where he explains why it suffices for salvation to belong to the Church *in desire* for those who “carefully keeping the precepts of God are disposed to obey God.”

In the revised Outline on the Church of *Vatican Council I* it was said: “We define it to be a dogma of the Catholic Faith that outside of the one Church of Christ there is no hope of salvation.” This assertion was explained to be about *the necessity of means in desire*. And although the phrase *necessity of means*, which was present in the first draft, was suppressed, nevertheless the same meaning was retained, as is certain from the attached *annotations*.⁸

Pius XII in the *Encyclical “Mystici Corporis”* clearly distinguished between those who *actually* are incorporated as members of the Church, and those who adhere to the Church only *in desire*. For, while treating

6. See *Acta I Conventus Velehradensis* 15ff.; G. Thils, *Les Notes de l'Eglise* 340f.; V. Morel, *Le Corps mystique du Christ et l'Eglise Catholique Romaine*: *NouvRevTh* 70 (1948) 703-726. See what we said about these *Irenists* above in n.1007, and 1027 note 8. On the opinion of M. Cano, see F. Suarez, *De fide* d.12 s.4 n.22.

7. See G. Puerto, *Fuera de la Iglesia no hay salvación*: *IllustCler* 46 (1953) 254-264.

8. Msi 53,312; see 51,541. For the explanation by P. Kleutgen, see Msi 53,323.

the members, out of whom the Mystical Body on earth is composed, he says: "Only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of Baptism and profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act or been severed therefrom, for very grave crimes, by the legitimate authority." But towards the end of this, among those who do not *actually* belong to the body of the Catholic Church, he mentions those who "may be related to the mystical Body of the Redeemer by some unconscious *yearning* and *desire*," whom he by no means excludes from eternal life, but he does warn them that they should strive to free themselves from that state, in which they cannot be certain about their own eternal salvation, since "they are deprived of those many great heavenly gifts and aids which can be enjoyed only in the Catholic Church." Surely with these words he is reproaching both those who exclude from eternal salvation all those adhering to the Church *with an implicit desire alone*, and those who falsely assert that men in any religion whatever can be saved in like manner.⁹

Finally, the *Holy Office*, on the occasion of the condemnation of Leonard Feeney, accurately explained this doctrine when it said: "among those things that the Church has always preached and will never cease to preach is contained also that infallible statement by which we are taught that 'outside the Church there is no salvation.' However, this dogma must be understood in that sense in which the Church herself understands it. For, it was not to private judgments that our Savior gave for explanation those things that are contained in the deposit of faith, but to the teaching authority of the Church.

"Now, in the first place the Church teaches that in this matter there is question of a most strict command of Jesus Christ. For he explicitly enjoined on his apostles to teach all nations to observe everything that he himself had commanded. Now, among the commandments of Christ, that one holds not the least place by which we are told to be incorporated by Baptism into the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the Church, and to remain united to Christ and to his vicar, through whom he himself in a visible manner governs the Church on earth. Therefore, no one will be saved who, knowing the Church to have been divinely established by Christ, nevertheless refuses to submit to the Church or withholds obedience from the Roman Pontiff, the vicar of Christ on earth.

9. Pius XII, "*Mystici Corporis*": AAS 35 (1943) 202.243. We give an explanation of the words of Pius XII, which the *Holy Office* gives in the Letter with which it rebuked Leonard Feeney: AmerEcclRev 127 (1952) 307-311; see J.C. Fenton in the same magazine p.450-461.

“Not only did the Savior command that all nations should enter the Church, but he also decreed the Church to be the means of salvation, without which no one can enter the kingdom of heavenly glory. In his infinite mercy God has willed that the effects, necessary for one to be saved, of those helps to salvation that are directed towards man’s final end, not by intrinsic necessity, but only by divine institution, can also be obtained in certain circumstances, when (those helps) are employed only through desire and longing. This we see clearly stated in the sacred Council of Trent, both in reference to the sacrament of regeneration and in reference to the sacrament of Penance (D 1524, 1543).

“The same in its own degree must be asserted of the Church, insofar as she is the general help to salvation. Since, in order that one may obtain eternal salvation, it is not always required that he be incorporated into the Church actually as a member, but it is necessary that at least he be united to her by desire and longing. However, this desire need not always be explicit, as it is in catechumens; but when a person suffers from invincible ignorance, God accepts also an implicit desire, so called because it is included in that good disposition of soul whereby a person wishes his will to be conformed to the will of God.” This doctrine is confirmed by the words of Pius XII, which we quoted above, and also by the cited Letters of Pius IX (D 2865, 2865-2867), and he also says this: “Nor must it be thought that any kind of desire of entering the Church suffices for one to be saved. It is necessary that the desire by which one is related to the Church be animated by perfect charity. The implicit desire can produce no effect unless a person has supernatural faith” (Heb. 11:6; D 1532).¹⁰

1095. Theological note. From the documents of the Church it is clear that the necessity of belonging to the true Church is *a dogma of faith*. *A necessity of means*, according to the same documents, is either *implicitly defined* or at least *theologically certain*. For, the documents stress that *no one* can be saved outside of the Church (D 792, 802); therefore not infants. But infants are not subject to the necessity of a precept; therefore *a necessity of means* is taught.

1096. Proof. PART 1. The Church is necessary for salvation with a necessity of means.

A necessity of means is proved in general.

10. For the letter of the Holy Office and a commentary, see AmerEccRev 127 (1952) 307-311, 450-461; SalTer 41 (1953) 22-26.

A. Baptism is necessary for salvation for all with a necessity of means either actually or in desire. But the immediate and necessary end of Baptism is to join men to the Church. Therefore the Church is necessary for all with a necessity of means either actually or in desire. The *conclusion* is clear, because if Baptism is necessary for salvation, a fortiori that must be said to be necessary for salvation because of which immediately and necessarily Baptism itself is given.

The major is proved from John 3:5, *Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God.* Where 1) he is speaking about the necessity of Baptism for all; therefore also for little children; but the necessity of a precept cannot be applied to little children; therefore Baptism is said to be necessary with a necessity of means.

2) In John 3:5 the concern is with spiritual rebirth; therefore it is necessary for supernatural life, as natural generation is for natural life; but this is necessary with a necessity of means; therefore also the former. That there he is speaking about the *desire only* is clear from the interpretation of the *Council of Trent* of the text, John 3:5: D 1524; and also from what we will say immediately in n. 1100.

1097. Proof of the minor. 1) The *immediate* purpose of Baptism is to be joined to the Church, as is certain from 1 Cor. 12:13. *For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body*, where the nature of an end (εἰς) is expressed: ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν (see the *Council of Trent*: D 1671-1672; see also the *Council of Florence*: D 1314-1316). 2) The *necessary* end of Baptism is being joined to the Church. For, although the principal end of Baptism is to confer grace, nevertheless, as is proved in the treatise on the sacraments, Baptism validly received always and necessarily confers an indelible character and joins one to the Church, and therefore it cannot be repeated (D 1609). But there can be a valid Baptism which does not confer grace. Therefore the necessary end of Baptism is not to confer grace, but to join a person to the Church.¹¹

This last *minor* is clear, because there can be a Baptism conferred correctly and with the necessary intention, and therefore valid, but on a subject not properly disposed to receive sanctifying grace; the result is that it is purely fruitless (see n.1021).

1098. B. For a man's salvation it is necessary with a necessity of means to belong to Christ. But no one belongs to Christ unless he is joined to the Church. Therefore for salvation it is necessary with a necessity of means to

11. See the Decree of the Holy Office, D 3128; S.Th. III, q. 68, a. 1 ad 1 and 3; 4 d.6 q.1 a.3 sol. 1 and 3.

belong to the Church.¹²

The major is proved a) because to belong to Christ through faith is the indispensable means for salvation, which can be had only from Christ: John 3:14-18; 36; Acts 4:12; because just as original sin comes through generation from Adam, so salvation comes to men through justification from Christ: Rom. 5:12-18; c) because Christ is the only Mediator from whom there is redemption and salvation: 1 Tim. 2:4-6.

The minor is proved because the Church is the place in which Christ perpetually carries out his work of salvation (D 3050); for Christ committed to the Church alone his salutary mission: John 17:18; 20:21; and this is to be exercised with the assistance of Christ himself: Matt. 28:20; so that there is an equal relation of salvation to Christ and to the Church; Luke 10:16: *he who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me.*

1099. C. For man's salvation it is necessary with a necessity of means to be united with Christ and to participate in the life of the Holy Spirit. But those who obtain this are only those who belong to the Mystical Body of Christ animated by the Holy Spirit, which is the Church. Therefore it is necessary for man with a necessity of means to belong to the Church.¹³

The major is proved a) from John 15:16, where the necessity of union with Christ is expressed explicitly; b) from Gal. 5:16-25, where the necessity of participating in the life of the Holy Spirit is inculcated.

The minor is proved a) from the thesis on the Mystical Body of Christ, which is the visible Church herself; b) from Eph. 5:23-29, where Christ is shown as the Savior of the Body of the Church, for which he handed himself over and which he uniquely loves, nourishes and fosters as his own spouse.¹⁴

1100. PART 2. In particular, we now prove the necessity of the means of belonging to the Church, which is not absolute but disjunctive, that is, either *actually or in desire*, at least implicitly.

A. From the argument taken from the necessity of Baptism this alone has been proved, as we have pointed out expressly.

B. Other arguments are to be understood also concerning the necessity of means either actually or in desire. For, charity or perfect contrition

12. This argument was proposed by the Theologians at *Vatican Council I* in the Outline of the *Constitution on the Church* c.6: Msi 51,541; 53,312; see S.Th. III, q. 68, a. 1 and ad 1.

13. This argument was already used by St. Augustine (R 1824), and it was also proposed by the Theologians at *Vatican Council I*: Msi 51,541; 51,312.

14. See *Vatican Council I*, Outline *On the Church*: Msi 53,312.

justifies. But in perfect charity the desire of belonging to the Church is contained at least implicitly. Therefore the necessity of means of belonging to the Church must be understood not as absolute, but as disjunctive, that is, either actually or with an implicit desire.

The major is clear from Matt. 22:37-40; John 14:21-24; Rom. 13:8-10; 1 Cor. 13:1-8; 1 Pet. 4:8; 1 John 4:7f.16. Consult the decrees against de Bay in D 1931-1933, 1970f.

The minor is certain from the nature of the matter. For, if charity is perfect, that is, love of God which is absolutely the greatest, doubtless implicitly it contains a sincere will of doing everything that God wills.¹⁵

1101. PART 3. It is necessary with a necessity of precept to belong to the Church.

A. It is necessary for all men with the necessity of a precept to obtain eternal salvation. Therefore also all those things are necessary with a necessity of precept that are required for salvation. But to belong to the Church is necessary for salvation. Therefore also the precept.

B. The precept of entering the Church and persevering in it is certain
a) from Luke 10:10-12.16, where he deals with the precept of entering the Church.

b) From Matt. 18:17f., where the precept of persevering in the Church is contained.

c) From Mark 16:15f., where the precept is imposed under the danger of salvation.

1102. Finally, the necessity of belonging to the Church *is confirmed* from the testimonies of the holy Fathers.

St. Ignatius (+ 107): "Those who have returned repentant to the unity of the Church will belong to God... Make no mistake, brethren. No one who follows another into schism inherits the kingdom of God" (R 56).

St. Irenaeus (ca. 180): "In the Church God has set... all the other means through which the Spirit works; of which all those are not partakers who do not join themselves to the Church" (R 226).

Origen (ca. 250): "If anyone wishes to be saved, let him come to this house... outside of this house, that is, outside of the Church, no one is saved" (R 537).

St. Cyprian (251): "He who has abandoned the Church will not arrive at the rewards of Christ. He cannot have God as a father who does not have

15. On the disjunctive necessity of the means, actually or in desire, see the explanation of Pius IX (D 2865-2867) and the Outline *On the Church* of Vatican Council I: Msi 53,312.323; see above n. 1094.

the Church as a mother. If whoever was outside the ark of Noah was able to escape, he too who is outside the Church escapes" (R 557). Again the same Father in 256: "There is no salvation outside the Church."¹⁶

Lactantius (ca. 310): "It is the Catholic Church alone which retains true worship. This is the temple of God, into which if anyone shall enter, or from which if any shall go out, he is estranged from the hope of life and eternal salvation" (R 637).

1103. St. Jerome (ca. 378): "This is the house where alone the paschal lamb can be rightly eaten. This is the ark of Noah, and he who is not found in it shall perish when the flood prevails" (R 1346). The comparison with the ark of Noah, which henceforth is often found in the ecclesiastical authors, had been used already by St. Cyprian (R 557; see D 870-872).¹⁷

St. Augustine (ca. 417): "Let the faithful become the Body of Christ, if they wish to live by the Spirit of Christ. None lives by the Spirit of Christ but the body of Christ" (R 1825; see R 1478). He also said (ca. 418): "Outside of the Catholic Church one can have everything except salvation... but never can one find salvation except in the Catholic Church" (R 1858).

St. Fulgentius, *De fide* (ca. 530): "Most firmly hold that... all who finish this life outside of the Catholic Church will go into eternal fire" (R 2275, 2273; hence the definition of the *Council of Florence*, D 1351).

1104. *The Catechism of the Council of Trent*, taking over this tradition and the teaching of St. Thomas, says: "The Church is also called universal because all those who desire to obtain eternal salvation must embrace it and hold on to it; it is no otherwise than with those who entered the *ark* lest they perish in the flood." Likewise St. Thomas said: "... the unity of the Mystical Body, without which there can be no salvation; for there is no entering into salvation outside the Church, just as in the time of the deluge there was none outside the ark, which denotes the Church."¹⁸

1105. Scholium. *Infants and adults outside the Church are deprived of heaven in different ways.* Therefore *infants*, who are incapable of eliciting an implicit desire of belonging to the Church, if, except in the case of martyrdom, they should die without Baptism, are deprived of supernatural beatitude, however it does not therefore follow that they are punished with the pains of hell, because they died without being guilty of grave personal

16. St. Cyprian, *Epist.* 73: ML 3,1169.

17. The similitude of the ark of Noah appears in 1 Pet. 3:20f.; see S.Th. III, q. 73, a. 3.

18. *Catechism of the Council of Trent* part I a.9 n.17; S.Th. III, Q. 73, a. 3.

sin, as is explained in the treatise on predestination and the salvific will of God.

1106. But *adults*, because of their full use of reason, who have died without Baptism and lacking at least an implicit desire of belonging to the Church, in the present order of grace, *de facto*, are lacking such a desire not without their own fault and are damned, as Pius IX taught (D 2865-2867). For, according to the teaching of St. Thomas: "This pertains to divine providence that he gives to each one the things necessary for salvation, provided on his part he does not place an obstacle. For if someone, raised in a forest or among brute animals, were to follow the lead of natural reason in the search for good and flight from evil, it must be held for certain either that God will reveal to him by an internal revelation the things necessary to believe or will send to him a preacher of the faith, as he sent Peter to Cornelius" (Acts 10).¹⁹

1107. Objections.²⁰ According to the thesis, all men who die not belonging to the body of the Church are damned. But it is wrong to say this. Therefore the thesis is false.

I distinguish the major: All infants, who die not belonging to the body of the Church, are deprived of the vision of God, but they are not subjected to the punishments of hell, *conceded*; all adults, who die not belonging to the body of the Church, are deprived of the beatific vision of God and are punished with the pains of hell, *I subdistinguish:* if they die with the desire of belonging to the Church, *denied*; if they die without such a desire, *again I subdistinguish:* and they lack this desire and are damned because of their own personal guilt, *conceded*; without their own personal guilt, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; the consequent and consequence are denied.*

1108. 2. Outside the Catholic Church there can be and there are acts of perfect charity. But with an act of perfect charity a man is justified and saved. Therefore outside the Catholic Church there can be and there is justification and salvation.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. With an act of perfect charity a man is justified and saved, since in such an act, at least virtually and implicitly, the desire of belonging to the Church is included, *conceded*;

19. S.Th., *De verit.* q.14, a. 11 ad 1. For the attempts of recent authors to save infants who die without Baptism, see W.A. van Roo, *Infants Dying without Baptism*: Greg 35 (1954) 406-473.

20. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 2 (1940) th.12.

without such a desire, at least virtually and implicitly, a man is justified and saved, *denied*. *The consequent is distinguished in the same way; the consequence is denied*.

1109. 3. Heretical and schismatic sects have true sacraments, by which grace is conferred. Therefore those living in such sects in good faith are justified and saved.

I distinguish the antecedent. Heretical and schismatic sects have true sacraments, which, as such, actually or in desire incorporate into the Catholic Church those who in good faith receive them, *conceded*; which, as such, incorporate them into false sects, *I subdistinguish*: apparently and only materially, *I bypass that*: really and formally, *denied*. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*. Those living in good faith in false sects by the grace of the Sacraments are justified and saved, since actually or in desire they are incorporated really and formally into the Catholic Church, *conceded*; since apparently and only materially they seem to be incorporated into false sects, *denied*.

1110. 4. A child baptized in a non-Catholic sect is justified. But having been baptized in a non-Catholic sect the child is not incorporated into the Catholic Church. Therefore outside the Catholic Church there is justification and salvation.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. Having received Baptism in a non-Catholic sect a child is not incorporated into the Catholic Church, according to external circumstances and common estimation, *conceded*; according to the internal reality and theological truth, *denied*. For, a child validly baptized by anyone, actually and in truth is incorporated fully into the Catholic Church; for principally "it is Christ who baptizes,"²¹ although ministerially he uses non-Catholic men, who baptize with the intention of doing what the Catholic Church does, as is demonstrated in the treatise on the Sacraments.

1111. 5. An adult with attrition and in good faith, baptized in a non-Catholic sect, is justified. But neither in desire nor actually is he incorporated into the Catholic Church. Therefore outside the Catholic Church there is justification and salvation.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. An adult with attrition and in good faith, baptized in a non-Catholic sect, is not incorporated by *desire* into the Catholic Church, because he has only attrition, *I bypass the minor*:

21. St. Augustine, *Epist.* 89 n.5: ML 33,312.

he is not incorporated *actually* into the Catholic Church, *I subdistinguish*: apparently and only materially, *conceded*; really and formally, *denied*. In the distinction of the minor I said, *I bypass* that an adult with just attrition is not incorporated by desire into the Catholic Church, because other authors hold that attrition, along with a validly received Baptism, is equivalent to the desire that we require.²² We add a subdistinction, because according to the common teaching of theologians, someone who in good faith and with attrition alone receives a valid Baptism in a non-Catholic sect, is a *merely material* schismatic or heretic, but actually and formally he is incorporated into the Catholic Church, since merely material schism and heresy do not separate someone from the Body of the true Church, as is proved in thesis 26 on the members of the Church.

1112. 6. As has been explained, belonging to the body of the Church for man is necessary for salvation either in reality or in desire. But the fulfillment of the precepts is necessary for man for salvation either in reality or in desire. Therefore belonging to the body of the Church is necessary for man for salvation as a fulfillment of the precepts

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. Fulfillment of the precepts is necessary for salvation either in reality or in desire, for an infant, *denied*; for an adult, *I subdistinguish*: for someone who inculpably cannot omit the fulfillment of the precepts, *conceded*; for someone who inculpably can omit the fulfillment of the precepts, *denied*. And because of the given distinction, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

22. T. Zapelena, *loc. cit.*, objection 4.

NOTE

ON THE REASON WHY MEN BELONG TO THE SOUL AND TO THE BODY OF THE CHURCH

1113. On the concepts of the Soul and Body of the Church.

Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* ass.26 p.447-458; M. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* th.30-33; Lercher-Schlagenhafen, *Institut*. I n.437; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontif., Prolegom. De Ecclesia* § 11 n.1-3; G. Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* th.16f.; see n.392,2; R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.12 n.7; A. Michelitsch, *Theol. Fundam.* § 198f.; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 561-565, 573-577.

1114. After what we have considered regarding the Mystical Body of Christ, thesis 24, the necessity and also the means of belonging to the Church, thesis 28, and concerning the members of the Body of the Church, theses 25 and 26, it will help now to say something about the concepts of the Soul and the Body of the Church.

Among the authors a *twofold* way recurs in this matter, not only of speaking about it but also of conceiving it. We will propose briefly the twofold way of explaining it and we will do it under one and the same outline so that the difference between the two becomes clear.

1115. A. The first way. With St. Robert Bellarmine it holds: a) that the *Body* of the Church is "the whole external and visible organization which Christ gave to the Church";

b) But he calls the *soul* of the Church "the complex of gifts, virtues and graces of the supernatural life by which individual believers are joined to God and to the Church";

c) Hence he concludes that "*the Soul is much broader than the Body of the Church*";

d) He acknowledges that there are different grades whereby anyone more or less perfectly can belong to the Body or to the Soul of the Church;

e) He infers that *for salvation it is necessary to belong perfectly to the Soul of the Church*;

f) Finally, he concludes that, at the moment of death, those who have charity are saved, even if they live outside the Body of the Church; but sinners, who lack charity, are damned, although actually they are in the Body of the Church.¹

1. St. R. Bellarmine, *De Ecclesia militante* 1.3 c.2. See A. Michelitsch, *Theol. Fundam.* § 198f.; E. Hugon, *Hors de l'Eglise point de salut* (1927) 305.

1116. B. The second way. With more recent authors it holds that: a) The *Body* of the Church is a society of men reborn by Baptism who are united by bonds of the profession of faith, of subordination to the hierarchy and of sacred communion with her;

b) But it calls the *Soul* of the Church the Holy Spirit, inasmuch as the functions of the soul as such are attributed to him, which are, to inform and vivify the Body of the Church, and on the other hand the proper role of which is to be informed and vivified by its soul;

c) Hence it concludes that *the Soul is not broader than the Body of the Church*;

d) It acknowledges that there are different grades whereby more or less perfectly in individuals this active and passive information and vivification can be obtained;

e) It infers that *for salvation it is necessary perfectly to belong to the animated-Body of the Church either actually or in desire*;

f) Finally, it concludes that, at the moment of death, those who have charity are saved because they belong perfectly to the animated-Body of the Church either actually or in desire, but sinners, who lack charity, are damned because they do not belong perfectly to the animated-Body either actually or in desire.²

1117. The second way of explaining it seems preferable to us, because it is more in agreement with the doctrine whereby we hold that the Soul of the Mystical Body of the Church is the Holy Spirit, thesis 24, and because it excludes in a better way the danger of distinguishing two Churches—one invisible and the other visible.

Furthermore, our explanation very well makes clear everything in this matter that needs to be explained. 1) It declares accurately the notion of the *Soul* of the Body of the Church. For, the Soul of the Body of the Church is the Holy Spirit to the extent that he, as it were, informs and vivifies the Body of the Church, or is the first and fundamental principle of its whole life. But surely this information and vivification can take place on several levels, of which the least is of those who, possessing the Baptismal character, manifestly have not broken the external bonds of faith, obedience and communion; and so they receive from the informing and vivifying Holy Spirit not only the external union with the Church and her social life, which they retain, but also the actual graces in order to increase and perfect the same union and life. Wherefore all, who really are *members of the Body of the Church*, receive some, although imperfect, *animating influx* of the

2. See Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* ass.26 p.447-458. See Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* (1941) 38-52. To this author the twofold distinction of the Soul of the Church is not acceptable: see D'Herbigny, n.343; Ch. Journet, *Coexistensivité de l'âme et du corps de l'Eglise*: *RevThom* 49 (1949) 197-205.

informing and vivifying *Holy Spirit*, and so also actually, in some true way, belong to the *Soul* of the Church. But those who are not actually members of the Body of the Church, receive no influx from the Holy Spirit, *inasmuch as the Holy Spirit properly is the Soul* informing and the principle vivifying the Body of the Church, and therefore they must not be said to belong actually to the *Soul* of the Church. And therefore the reason is understood why we say that *the Soul as such is not broader than the Body as such of the Church*.

1118. 2) It recognizes well the many types of influence which the Holy Spirit exercises *outside the Body of the Church*. For, it seems certain to us that those, who are actually outside the Body of the Church, do not receive any influence from the Holy Spirit *as the Soul of the Body of the Church*. But because of that it is not licit to conclude that they are devoid of absolutely all influence of the Holy Spirit.

For, the Holy Spirit, "the Lord and giver of life," because of the living functions permanently of informing and gently vivifying the Body of the Church, also exercises many other functions outside of her in order to restore and vivify the same Body of the Church. Therefore the Holy Spirit with his innumerable graces in many ways attracts the baptized, who are turned away from the Church, so that they will return to unity and he "enlightens every man coming into the world" (John 1:9) so that he may acknowledge the truth and truly be united to the body of the Church either actually or at least in desire.³

However, these and other actions of this kind are not to be attributed to the Holy Spirit, *inasmuch as being the Soul* quasi-formally he informs and principally vivifies the Body of the Church; *but inasmuch as God = Love* he works unceasingly outside the Body of the Church, led by his universal salvific will, by which *he desires all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth*: 1 Tim. 2:4.

3. See Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Institutiones* I n.437. On the comparison of a good dissident with a Catholic sinner, see Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* 2 677f.

CHAPTER III

On the properties and Notes of the true Church

ARTICLE I

ON THE UNIQUENESS AND VISIBILITY OF THE CHURCH

Thesis 29. Christ instituted his Church as unique and visible, and also as the true Church discernible from false churches.

1119. F. Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.4.8; Id., *Defensio fidei* l.1 c.7f.; Palmieri, *De Rom. Pont. Proleg. De Ecclesia* § 10.48; Wilmers, *n.29.35*; Dorsch, 556.614; Pesch, *Compend.* I n.224.240; De Guibert, n. 84.98; D'Herbigny, n.59; Schultes, a.17; Lercher, n.299; Zapelena, th.6.

1120. Connection. We have treated the social and supernatural nature of the Church. Now we intend to deal with the properties of the same Church, especially with those by which the true Church of Christ can be distinguished from false ones. We will begin with those that are the logical foundation of the others, namely, with the uniqueness and the visibility of the Church.

1121. Definition of terms. A *property* is that which is thought to pertain to some thing. That property is *accidental* which contingently inheres in some thing by way of an accident. But the property is *essential* that results from the essence of the thing and is in it necessarily. This essential property is distinguished into generic, specific and individual according as it proceeds from the generic, specific or individual essence of the thing.

A *property* is called *constitutive*, inasmuch as *in the ontological order* it pertains to that by which the thing is constituted in its essential or accidental being. But that property is called *distinctive*, which has a certain aspect by which *in the logical order* a thing can be distinguished from other similar things.

1122. *One* properly is opposed to divided, and is that which is undivided in itself, or which excludes inner division.

Unique properly is opposed to multiple, and is that which is *numerically one* or *individual*, or that which excludes every other individual of the same species. In moral beings, like the Church, unity can be distinguished easily from uniqueness, so that, for example, an individual Kingdom, even when its uniqueness remains, still can be in itself either one or divided, according

as its citizens under the same government mutually work for the same end or do not do so.¹

1123. *Visible in the strict sense* is that which is suitable to be perceived *through sight*. *Visible in the broad sense* is that which is suitable to be perceived *through the senses*. *The adequately visible* is that of which all the elements are visible. *The inadequately visible* is that of which not all, but only some of its elements are visible

A society of men, such as the Church is, can be visible in three ways: 1) *Materially* as consisting of men, or by reason of the *material element*, which is the visible men; 2) *Formally* as a society, or by reason of the *formal element*, which is the union of men and their working together for a common end; 3) *Distinctly* as this individual society, or by reason of the *individuating properties*, which are the distinctive properties whereby this numerically one society is distinguished from other similar ones.

A visible society of men can be either manifest or hidden. *Manifest* is that society whose visible elements are so open that they can be physically attained by the senses. *Hidden* is that visible society whose visible elements are so covered over by some obstacle that they cannot be perceived by the senses.

1124. State of the question. Concerning the Church of Christ we assert in the thesis: 1) that it is *unique*; 2) that it is also *formally* visible, although it is only inadequately and at least broadly visible; 3) that it is *distinctly visible*, that is, as the true Church discernible from false ones.

1125. Adversaries. 1) *Against the uniqueness of the Church.* *Indifferentists, Latitudinarians and Panchristians* deny not only the unity but also the uniqueness of the Church; they are opposed to the uniqueness of the Church because they hold that there are several Christian confessions completely independent of one another in government, but which are equally Churches of Christ; therefore, according to them, the Church of Christ is not numerically one or individual, but it is a complex of several individual Churches comprehended under the same species of the Church of Christ.²

1126. Here are some particular cases: a) The *indifferentists* hold men can serve God and please him equally in any religion and in any Christian confession and hope to receive from him eternal salvation based on any

1. See D. Palmieri, *Proleg. de Ecclesia* § 48.

2. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.227,5; L. Marchal, *Puséisme*: DTC 13,1363-1425; R. Aubert, *Le S. Siège et l'union des Eglises* (1947); Id., *Problèmes de l'Unité chrétienne*, with an appendix on the Congress held in Lund (1952).

kind of faith, as can be proved from the *Allocution "Singulari quadam"* and the *Encyclical "Quanto conficiamur moerore"* of Pius IX: D 1646 [34th ed.], 2865-2867.

b) *Latitudinarians*, such as were among the Anglicans, Palmer, before his conversion, and Pusey, who developed the theory of the Church with three branches; they said that three Christian confessions, namely, the Roman Catholic, the Greek Orthodox, the Anglican Catholic, even though they retain full independence in their own government, nevertheless are like three branches equally sprouting forth from the same Christian trunk and forming the so-called tripartite Church, as is clear from the Letter of the *Holy Office*, "*Apostolicae Sedi*": D 2885-2888.

c) Then there are the contemporary *Irenists* holding that Catholics, although separated from other Christians be reason of the social Body, nevertheless can establish with them a true union of Churches, by reason of the Mystical Body, of which they are members, as was explained in n.1093.

1127. d) Finally, the *Panchristians* or promoters of Ecumenism, are very much opposed to the doctrine on the uniqueness of the Church; they are trying to establish a certain federal union of all Christian Confessions, but at the same time preserving the independence of each one. In order to promote this confederation of Churches several international Congresses have been held, the main ones of which are these: in 1910 in Edinburgh "Congress of Missionaries" in which two main factions appeared with these two titles: *Life and Action* and *Faith and Order*; then in the year 1925, in *Stockholm* under the title of *Life and Action* they tried to obtain the collaboration of the Churches, prescinding completely from questions of dogma and organization; but in 1927 in *Lausanne* under the title of *Faith and Order* they tried to find some dogmas and principles of organization to which all could agree, so that on them a confederation of Churches could be built.

After that, in 1937, two other Congresses were held—one in Oxford under the title of *Life and Action*, and the other in Edinburgh under the title of *Faith and Order*. After those meetings in the same year of 1937 a common assembly was established under the title of *World Council of Churches* in order to unite and give direction to the goals of the two previous tendencies. Hence in 1948 in *Amsterdam*, now under the name of the *World Council of Churches*, a foundational Congress was held, to which were invited the Churches which at least believe that Christ is God and the Savior of mankind, and at which the desired *Confederation* of all

the Churches of Christ was prepared.³

After the publication of the Acts and resolutions of the Amsterdam Congress in 1949, the permanent Commission of the Ecumenical Council of Churches published a complementary declaration in Toronto in July 1950, in which it is openly admitted: "The divisions existing between the Churches are in contradiction to the nature of the Church." But in 1952 the advocates of the theme of *Faith and Order*, in their Congress held in Lund, admitted that the division of the Churches cannot be reconciled with unity in Christ.⁴

In Evanston in 1954 the *World Council of Churches* celebrated its second congress. The theme was: *Christ, the Only Hope of the World*. Unanimity, as they admit, was not achieved, because among them the *eschatological aspect* and the *temporal aspect* of the object itself of Christian hope were conceived in different ways; and especially, because Protestant liberals are miles apart from the conservatives in interpreting the texts of Scripture which deal with hope in Christ. However, they tried eagerly to arrive at unanimity in determining *theoretically* the doctrine on hope in Christ, so that from it *in a practical way* they might offer an efficacious testimony to the whole world. Also at Evanston they dealt with the serious problem raised at Lund, where the question remains: "Can the Churches be said to be united in Christ, which among themselves are so diverse? If the answer is negative: What unity should exist between the Churches, so that they can be said to be united in Christ?" All acknowledged that the division is a sin of the Churches and they strongly stressed the obligation of all of striving to discern and to restore the unity that Christ desires. In Evanston much more than ever elsewhere the *Ecumenists* manifested their desire to restore fully the unity of the Churches.⁵

1128. 2) *Concerning the visibility of the Church*, Protestants are opposed: a) *Lutherans* saying that the true Church is the congregation of

3. S. Zankow, *Das Orthodoxe Christentum* 75-79; F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* 14-219; A. Garmendia de Otaola, *La Conferencia mundial Pan-Protestante para el año 1948*: RazFe 137 (1948) 340-347; see CivCat (1948,4) 441; F.M. Sanz, *Las Conferencias de Lambeth y Amsterdam*: RevEspT 8 (1948) 677-694. On the meeting held in Amsterdam from August 22 to September 4, 1948, you will find ample information in A. Jansen, *La première Assemblée de Conseil Oecumenique des Eglises*: La documentation Catholique 46 (1949) 541-567, 665-700, 735-746. For the Acts, talks and conclusions of this meeting, see *Conseil Oecumenique des Eglises: Désordre de l'homme et dessein de Dieu. Documents de l'Assemblée d'Amsterdam* 5 v. (1949). A. Delmée, *De mot, oecumenica*: Apol 23 (1950) 31-103.
4. *Minutes and Reports of the Third Meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches*, Toronto, July 9-15 (1950) P.85; Irenik 24 (1951) 39; C. Dumont, *La conférence de Lund*: VieSpir 88 (1953) 98; Irenik 25 (1952) 390-406; M. Bévenot: Istina (1954) 164-75. On Ecumenism, see *XII Semana Española de Teología, El movimiento ecumenista* (1953); E.F. Hanohoe, *Catholic Ecumenism*, Washington, C.U. (1953).
5. On *Evanston*: D. Dumont, Versl'UnCh n.65-66 (1954) 73-90; Istina 1 (1954) 80-106, 132-158, 311-329; D.C. Lialine: Irenik 27 (1954) 469-406; DocCath 51 (1954) 1313-1335; C. Dumont-B.Olivier: RevNouv 19 (1954) 76-87. The Documents are in Istina 1 (1954) 107-128, 176-218, 330-362.441.509.

the justified: "I believe that on earth there is a small congregation of the Saints and a communion put together out of purely holy men, under the one Head, Christ, brought together by the Holy Spirit," is what Luther taught, whom the *Augustan Confession* followed.⁶ The Jansenist Quesnel agreed with Luther and also the Synod of *Pistoia*: D 2473-2479, 2615. b) *Calvinists* holding that the true Church is the congregation of the predestined only: "What is the Church? It is the body and society of the faithful whom God has predestined to eternal life," thus Calvin; from this the *Confession of the Scots* infers: "This Church is invisible, known by the one God, who alone knows whom he has chosen."⁷ Earlier John Hus had taught similar things: D 1201-1204, 1221. c) Recent *rationalists*, like Sabatier and Harnack, who deny that the external and social form of the Church comes from Christ, and say that the Church of Christ is constituted by those who have a purely spiritual and internal awareness of their divine sonship with reference to God as Father, but that the external and social form of the Church arose later, having been produced by primitive Christianity.⁸

1129. Doctrine of the Church. 1) *The uniqueness of the Church*, as distinct from her unity, is taught by Boniface VIII in the Bull "*Unam Sanctam*" and by Leo XIII in the *Encyclical "Satis cognitum"*: D 870-872, 3303f. Moreover, Pius XI in the *Encyclical "Mortalium animos"* exposes and rejects the teachings of the Panchristians, and finally teaches this:

"The union of Christians can only be fostered by promoting the return to the one true Church of Christ ... For since the mystical body of Christ, in the same manner as his physical life, is one (1 Cor. 12:12), compacted and fitly joined together (Eph. 4:15), it would be foolish and out of place to say that the mystical body is made up of members which are disunited and scattered abroad." See the recent of the Holy Office *on the ecumenical movement*.⁹

6. Luther, *Catechismus maior*: ed. Müller-Kolbe, *Symbolische Bücher der evangel. lutherischen Kirche* 456f.; *Confessio Augustana*, a.75: ed. Müller-Kolbe, *loc.cit.*, 40. See Wilmers' *De Ecclesia* n.36. Luther, response *ad lib. A. Catharini* (1521): "Just as that invisible and spiritual rock (Christ) without sin is perceptible by faith alone, so it is necessary that the invisible and spiritual Church without sin is perceptible by faith alone": Ed. Weimar, t.7 p.299.

7. Calvin, *Catechismus Ecclesiae genevensis*: ed. Karl Müller, *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* 125. Peter Jurieu, a Calvinist, who with his contemporaries Bossuet and Fenelon was very polemical, held that the Protestants began to deny the visibility of the Church in order to evade the difficulty raised by the Catholic Theologians: If the Church of Christ, they urged, is visible, where were the Lutheran and Calvinist Churches which could be seen before Luther and Calvin? See D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.60,2 with note 1.

8. See what we said about this in thesis 1, n.42f. and in thesis 3, n.124-127.

9. Pius XI, *Encycl. "Mortalium animos"*: AAS 20 (1928) 14f.; Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis"* (AAS 35, 203f.). *On the ecumenical movement*: Holy Office (AAS 42 (1950) 142-147.

1130. 2) *Vatican Council I* implicitly defined the visibility of the Church: D 3012, 3013-3014, 3055.

Leo XIII teaches it explicitly in his *Encyclical "Satis cognitum"*:

"If we consider the chief end of his Church and the proximate efficient causes of salvation, it is undoubtedly *spiritual*; but in regard to those who constitute it, and the things which lead to these spiritual gifts, it is *external* and necessarily visible... The ordinary and chief means of obtaining grace are external: that is to say, the sacraments which are administered by men specially chosen for that purpose, by means of certain ordinances. Jesus Christ commanded his Apostles and their successors to the end of time to teach and rule the nations. He ordered the nations to accept their teaching and obey their authority. But his correlation of rights and duties in the Christian commonwealth not only could not have been made permanent, but could not even have been initiated except through the senses, which are of all things the messengers and interpreters. For this reason the Church is so often called in Holy Writ a body (1 Cor. 12:27), and even the *body of Christ*—and precisely because it is a body is the Church visible" (ASS 28,709f.).

Similarly Pius XII in the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis"* (AAS 35,199f.): "Now if the Church is a body, it must be something one and undivided, and it must also be something concrete and visible... It is therefore an aberration from divine truth to represent the Church as something intangible and invisible, as a mere "pneumatic" entity joining together by an invisible link a number of communities of Christians in spite of their difference in faith."

Likewise the teaching of Pius XI in the *Encyclical "Mortalium animos"* is explicit on the visibility of the Church, for he says:

"Christ our Lord instituted his Church as a perfect society, external of its nature and perceptible to the senses, which should carry on in the future work of the salvation of the human race, under the leadership of one head, with an authority teaching by word of mouth, and by the ministry of the sacraments, the founts of heavenly grace; for which reason he arrested by comparison the similarity of the Church to a kingdom, to a house, to a sheepfold, and to a flock."¹⁰

1131. 3) At *Vatican Council I* an explicit definition of the Uniqueness and Visibility of the Church was prepared.

a) *On Uniqueness*. In Outline I, cn.4: "If any one says that the true Church is not in itself one body, but consists of various and scattered societies with the Christian name, and through them is diffused; or that various societies disagreeing among themselves on the profession of faith and separated from communion, constitute the one and universal Church of Christ as members or parts, let him be anathema." The same thing was said more precisely in the revised Outline, cn.5: "If any one says that all the sects or only

10. Pius XI, *loc.cit.*, 8.

some of them, which are separated from the Roman Church, together with her constitute the universal Church of Christ, let him be anathema.”¹¹

b) *On Visibility*: in Outline I, cn.3: “If any one says that the Church of the divine promises is not an external and visible society, but totally internal and invisible, let him be anathema.” The same idea appears more distinctly in the revised Outline, cn.4: “If any one says that the Church, to which the divine promises were made, is not an external and visible society of the faithful, but a spiritual society of the predestined or of the justified known only to God, let him be anathema.”¹²

1132. Theological note. We hold that the whole thesis, not only as *Catholic doctrine*, from the *Bull* of Boniface VIII and from the *Encyclicals* of Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII, which we have cited, and not only as *proximate to a conciliar definition* from the cited Acts of *Vatican Council I*, but also as *implicitly defined* in the decrees of the same *Vatican Council*.

a) *The Uniqueness* of the Church is *implicitly defined* in the Vatican definition of the Primacy, because in it the Council says: “In order that... the whole multitude of believers might be preserved in unity of faith and communion... he established in Peter a perpetual principle and visible foundation of this twofold unity” (D 3051), and further: “All the faithful must believe... that the Roman Pontiff is the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians,” or he is the same when “acting in the office of Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians” (D 3059, 3074). Indeed this *uniqueness of supreme power* instituted by Christ *together with the complete universality of his subjects*, that is, of all Christians, includes the uniqueness of the Church and totally excludes the legitimacy of any and all groups of Christians separated from the Roman Pontiff. b) *The Visibility* of the Church, not only *formal*, but also *distinct*, was *implicitly defined by Vatican Council I*, as is crystal clear from the meaning of the words: D 3012f.

1133. Proof 1). The uniqueness of the Church is proved by arguments proposed by Leo XIII in the *Encyclical “Satis cognitum”*: ASS 28,712. D 3303f.

a) The Church is for all men one individual flock under one Shepherd, Christ, and under one vicar of Christ, Peter or his successor, as is certain from the theses on the Primacy of Peter and on the successor of Peter in the Primacy, the Roman Pontiff (theses 5 and 9; see John 3:14-18; 10:14-16;

11. *Vatican Council I*: Msi 51,551; 53,316. The same Council explains this teaching more at length in the corresponding chapters, Outline I, #5 and the revised Outline, #6: Msi 51,541; 53,311f.

12. *Vatican Council I*: Msi 51,551; 53,316; and it is treated more at length in the corresponding chapters 4 and 5: Msi 51,540f.; 53,310f.

21:15-170. But this flock excludes every other one independent of the one Shepherd and his only vicar, as is per se evident. Therefore the Church of Christ is unique.

b) The Church of Christ is one singular house built on one fundamental rock. *On THIS rock I will build my Church*, as is clear from the thesis on the promise of the Primacy (thesis 4; see Matt. 16:18f.). But this individual house excludes every other one constructed outside this one foundation, as is evident. Therefore the Church is unique.

1134. c) The Church is one singular mystical Body of Christ compact like His physical body, under the principal direction of the one Head, Christ, vivified by the Holy Spirit as by a unique quasi-soul, as we know from the thesis on the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ (thesis 24). But his mystical Body, compact like a human physical body, does not tolerate autonomous members that live separated from one another, as would be the case with Christians groups separated and independent of each other (see 1 Cor. 12:20-27). Therefore the Church that Christ willed is unique or one of a kind. The minor is evident and Pius XI explains it clearly in the words cited above (n.1129).

1135. d) Christ willed that his Church should be a monarchic society and at the same time obligatory for absolutely all men. But such a society cannot not be unique. Therefore Christ willed that his Church would be unique. *The major.* Christ willed first of all that his Church would be a monarchic society that is governed by his only Vicar on earth with supreme and full power, as we have proved in theses 6 and 10; in the second place, he willed to bind all men with the obligation to embrace his society, and to do so with a necessity of means to obtain salvation, as was proved in theses 3 and 28.

The minor. Such a society cannot not be unique: in the first place, because as monarchic and governed by the only Vicar of Christ, there cannot be other legitimate Christian societies that are independent of its supreme authority, since this Vicar of Christ has received a divine mandate of having all men subject to himself; in the second place, because as obligatory for all men, there cannot also be men who establish other Christian societies that are independent of the only Vicar of Christ, since absolutely all men are strictly bound to be fully subject to the only Vicar of Christ on earth. Wherefore rightly Leo XIII concludes: "To justify the existence of more than one Church it would be necessary to go outside this world and to create a new and unheard-of race of men" (ASS 28,712).

1136. Proof 2). The formal visibility of the Church is proved by the argument which is developed in the revised Outline of *Vatican Council I*.¹³ That society is formally visible whose social bonds are visible. But the social bonds, by which the union of the Church and the working towards its end are established, are visible. Therefore the Church is formally visible.

The major is clear from the notion itself of formal visibility. *The minor* is proved, for the social bonds, by which the union of the Church and the working towards its end are operative, are the *authentic Magisterium*, by which the truths of the faith to be believed by the heart and confessed by the mouth are proposed to the faithful, the *sacred Ministry*, by which worship is offered to God with sacred rites and the sacraments are dispensed to the people; the *social government*, by which the faithful with salutary discipline are ordained and directed to the end of the Church. But these factors cannot be invisible. Therefore the social bonds, by which the union of the Church and the working for her end are established, are visible.

1137. Proof 3). The distinct visibility of the Church, whereby it is discernible as the true Church from the false ones, is proved as a result of the theses on the uniqueness and necessity of the Church. For, the Church of Christ is a unique society and obligatory and necessary for all men. But it is necessary that a unique society, necessary and obligatory for all, be distinctly visible or that it be discernible as the true one from the false ones. Therefore the Church of Christ is a distinctly visible society or is the true one discernible from the false ones.

The major is certain, regarding the uniqueness from the first part of this thesis which has already been proved, and regarding its necessity from theses 3 and 28, which have already been proved. *The minor*: Because if the Church were not distinctly visible or discernible as the true Church from the false ones, it could not be imposed on all as uniquely obligatory and necessary, to which all must belong.

1138. *Visibility* that is not only *formal* but also *distinct* can be proved also from Isa. 2:2f.: *It shall come to pass in the latter days that the mountain of the house of the Lord shall be established as the highest of the mountains, and shall be raised above the hills;*

13. *The Vatican I revised Outline On the Church*: "They wander far from the true faith who contend that the Church of the faithful is not an external society, but an invisible society of the justified and the predestined. For since in the Church the *Magisterium* is divinely instituted, by which what is to be believed in the heart and confessed with the tongue is proposed to the people; also the *Ministry*, by which with sacred rites worship is offered to God and the divine mysteries are proclaimed to the people; and finally the *Government*, by which the faithful are restrained by salutary discipline: it is necessary that the Body itself of the Church be visible; because it embraces all those who are joined together with each other in the communion of the same faith and of the same sacraments and they are subject to the same Supreme Head, namely, the Roman Pontiff; although some of them are neither justified nor predestined, but are sinners and reprobates": Msi 53,310f.

and all the nations shall flow to it, and many peoples shall come, and say: "Come, let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; that he may teach us his ways and that we may walk in his paths." For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. He shall judge between the nations, and shall decide for many peoples; the same text is in Micah 4:1-3.

Hence I argue: Leo XIII in the *Encyclical "Satis cognitum"* (ASS 28,713), with St. Augustine and Optatus Milevitanus, teaches: "That the one Church should embrace all men everywhere and at all times was seen and foretold by Isaiah, when looking into the future he saw the appearance of a mountain conspicuous by its all-surpassing altitude."¹⁴ Therefore in the words of Isaiah we really have a description of the Church of Christ. But by the symbol of the temple on the mountain Isaiah sees and foretells the Church elevated above all the mountains; this is an image everywhere throughout the world so visible to all, that the nations from everywhere are attracted to it and the peoples eagerly run to it. Therefore in the words of Isaiah the Church of Christ is described not only formally but also as distinctly visible.

The first consequent is clear from the theses on the doctrinal authority of the Roman Pontiff (thesis 14f.), and because we know from *Vatican I* that he is the authentic Teacher "in order that, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he might reverently guard and faithfully explain the revelation or deposit of faith that was handed down through the Apostles" (D 3070). The subsumed *minor* and the last *consequent* are clearly proved from the reading of the words of Isaiah.¹⁵

1139. Objections. A. *Against the unicity of the Church.* Contrary factions are not opposed to social uniqueness, while contending with the administration and being governed by mutually independent powers. But various groups of Christians are contrary factions, while contending with the administration of the Church and being governed by mutually independent powers. Therefore various groups of Christians are not opposed to the social uniqueness of the Church.

I distinguish the major: Such factions are not opposed to the social uniqueness, if only *de facto*, but not *by right (de iure)* they are independent in government, *I bypass the major*; if not only *de facto*, but also *by right* they are constituted with an independent government, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Various groups of Christians are contrary factions, and not only *de facto*, but also *by right* constituted with an independent government, *conceded*; they are contrary factions and only *de facto*, but not *by right* are they constituted with an independent government, *denied*. And under the given distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence.* In the distinction above of the *major*, I said that I "bypass," because I do not want to spend time on this general question, although really the State, while civil wars are going on, and the Church, during the time of the so-called "Western Schism" seem to us to have had factions only *de facto*, but not *by right*, with an independent government, which then were not opposed to the social

14. Optatus Milevitanus, *De Schismate Donatistarum* 1.3 n.2: ML 11,996f.; St. Augustine, *In epistolam S. Ioannis ad Parthos* tr.1 n.13: ML 35,1988f.

15. I. Knabenbauer, *Cursus Scripturae*, In *Isaiam* 2,2f. See T. Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* th.6, for another argument.

uniqueness of the States or of the Church.

1140. 2. Mutually disagreeing factions in doctrine of faith and morals are not opposed to the uniqueness of the Church; they are always in the Church and also in the Roman Catholic Church. But the various dissident groups of Christians are factions mutually disagreeing in doctrine of faith or morals. Therefore the various groups of dissident Christians are not opposed to the uniqueness of the Church.

I distinguish the major. Such dissident factions are not opposed to the uniqueness of the Church, if they acknowledge the one supreme authority of all Christians to decide definitively concerning doctrines of faith or morals, and if they disagree only regarding doctrines not yet definitively decided by that authority, *conceded*; if they do not acknowledge the one supreme authority of all Christians to decide definitively concerning doctrines of faith or morals, and if they dissent concerning doctrines already definitively decided by it, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor also.* Groups of dissident Christians are factions that do not acknowledge the one supreme authority of Christians to decide definitively in matters of faith or morals, and dissent in doctrines already definitively decided by that authority, *conceded*; they are factions that acknowledge the one supreme authority of all Christians to decide definitively in matters of faith and morals, and they disagree only regarding doctrines not yet decided by it, *denied*. And because of these distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

1141. 3. The specific end of the Church is the sacramental sanctification of the faithful. But several societies of mutually disagreeing Christians really sanctify their members sacramentally. Therefore several societies of dissident Christians really are of the same species of the Church of Christ.

I distinguish the major. The specific end of the Church of Christ is the sacramental sanctification of the faithful, with the power granted by Christ especially to the Apostles and their legitimate successors, *conceded*; with a power in whatever way borrowed from the power given uniquely to the Apostles and to their successors, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Several societies of dissident Christians sanctify their faithful sacramentally, with a power in whatever way borrowed from the power given uniquely to the Apostles and their legitimate successors, *conceded*; with their own proper power received through legitimate succession from the Apostles, *denied*.

1142. For, as we know, from the institution of Christ in his Church only Peter, as the Vicar of Christ, and the College of Apostles established with Peter and under Peter received all the power, also of sanctifying, as their own, and they received it "for the perpetual safety and everlasting good of the Church" (D 3056). Therefore the same universal power pertains as something proper only to the legitimate successors of Peter and of the other Apostles, who are the Roman Pontiff and the residential Bishops, subject to the Vicar of Christ and having peace and communion with him, as has been established in theses 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9. But since the power of *Orders* is conferred sacramentally by the rite itself (*ex opere operato*) and its valid conferral and reception are independent of

the faith and probity of the one conferring it and the one receiving it (CIC 2372 [1917]); therefore the societies of Christian dissidents can validly obtain the power of *Orders*, but borrowed in some way or other, either mediately or immediately, from someone who has it properly; and hence it follows that they can sanctify their faithful sacramentally, if they rightly confer the Sacrament on them. However, they themselves do not properly effect this sanctification, but the one and only true Church of Christ confers it through them as if they were her own ministers, because the power itself by which it is conferred does not properly belong to them, but it pertains as proper only to the one true Church of Christ.¹⁶

1143. Objections. B. Against the visibility of the Church. 1. See the answers given in thesis 1, n.79-83, to the objections which are usually raised against the visibility of the Church from Matt. 13:44; Luke 17:20; John 4:23; Rom. 14:17; 1 Cor. 12:6.11.¹⁷

2. From 1 Pet. 2:5, where the Church is called *a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ*. But a spiritual house in which spiritual victims are offered is invisible. Therefore the Church is invisible.

I distinguish the major. The Church is called "a spiritual house" in order to offer "spiritual sacrifices" primarily and principally that are spiritual, *conceded*; exclusively spiritual, *denied*. For, St. Peter himself in 1 Pet. 5:1-6 describes the functions of the Church and the offices of the hierarchy, which cannot be anything but visible. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; the consequent and the consequence are denied.*

1144. 3. From Heb. 12:18-24, where he says: *For you have not come to what may be touched, a blazing fire... and the sound of a trumpet, and a voice whose words made the hearers entreat that no further messages be spoken to them... But you have come to Mount Zion and to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable angels in festal gathering... and to the spirits of just men made perfect*. From these words they argue thus: St. Paul makes a contrast between the gathering of the chosen people of the Old Testament and the Church founded by Christ the mediator of the New Testament. But the gathering of the chosen people of the O.T. is described as a mountain perceptible by the various senses. Therefore the Church of the N.T. is presented as invisible.

I distinguish the major. The contrast between the societies of both Testaments is made by St. Paul precisely by reason of the visibility of the one and the invisibility of the other, *denied*; the contrast is made by reason of a different spirit, namely, of *fear* and servitude in the O.T., but of *love* and perfection in the N.T., *I subdistinguish*: and with reference to the N.T., St. Paul positively so extols it that the principal and primary thing in it are the spiritual and supernal, *conceded*; but in such a way that the Apostle excludes from the N.T. the things in it that are visible and temporal, *denied*. *I bypass the minor and distinguish the consequent in the same way; also I deny the consequence.*

16. This doctrine is treated more at length in the treatise *On the Sacraments*.

17. See Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 622-628; I. Muncunill, *De Ecclesia* n.171-178; T. Zapelena, th.6.

1145. 4. The Church is an object of divine faith: "I believe in the holy Catholic faith": D 30. But divine faith is about objects that are not seen. Therefore the Church is invisible. This is the main argument of the Protestants.

I distinguish the major. Inasmuch as it is knowable by us because of the authority of God revealing, *conceded*; inasmuch as by us it is externally perceptible by the senses, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Divine faith is about objects known not by the natural perception of man, but by the supernatural revelation of God, *conceded*; divine faith is about objects which with the natural perception of man are not known under any aspect, *denied*. And given these distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

For, the object of divine faith is whatever has been manifested by God speaking in an attesting way. Indeed, God by his attesting speech can manifest things that are not knowable by the natural perception of man, and then things of this nature can be known only by divine faith. But God with his attesting speech can also manifest things which are knowable by natural human perception, and then things of this nature can be known by man in two ways—in one way because of the truth itself of things known by natural perception, and the other way because of the authority of God himself revealing, that is, by divine faith. But in the Church many supernatural realities have been revealed by God which can be known only by divine faith; many things have also been revealed by God which can be perceived naturally by the senses and the intellect. These latter elements are knowable in two ways—in one way because of their truth itself naturally perceived, and in the other way by divine faith because of the authority of God revealing. You will see more about the nature of the invisibility of the act of faith in the treatise *On Faith*.¹⁸

1146. 5. The formal and distinctive elements of the true Church are the baptismal character, intellectual faith, sanctifying grace, and other gifts of this kind. But these are all invisible. Therefore the Church, at least formally and distinctively, is not visible.

I distinguish the major. The gifts mentioned are formal and distinctive internal elements of the true Church inasmuch as the Church is a supernatural reality, *conceded*; they are formal and distinctive internal elements of the true Church inasmuch as the Church is a social reality, *denied*. *I concede the minor and also distinguish the consequent.* The Church is not visible by reason of the internal elements whereby formally it is constituted in its supernatural reality, *conceded*: by reason of the external elements whereby formally it is constituted in its social reality, *denied*.

1147. 6. The Church is especially specified and distinguished from every other society by reason precisely of the internal elements whereby formally it is constituted in its supernatural reality. But, according to that norm, the Church is not visible by reason of such internal elements. Therefore the Church is not distinguishable as supernaturally and specifically distinct from every other society.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. By reason of the internal elements whereby formally the Church is constituted in its supernatural reality the Church is not

18. See Dorsch, *loc.cit.*, 622-626; Muncunill, *loc.cit.*, n.177.

visible immediately and directly, *conceded*; mediately and indirectly, *denied*. Similarly *I distinguish the consequent*. As supernaturally and specifically distinct from every other society the Church is not discernible immediately and directly, *conceded*; mediately and indirectly, *denied*. For, the internal and supernatural elements of the Church immediately in themselves, and directly in the formal reason of the supernaturalness are not sensible; however, in a mediated way from their effects on the social life of men, and indirectly from their knowable and certainly known connection with other visible elements of the same Church, they become entirely sensible, which surely is sufficient as can be deduced from the defined terms of the thesis.

ARTICLE II

PROPERTIES OF THE CHURCH WHICH WE
PROFESS IN THE CREED**Thesis 30. Unity, Catholicity, Apostolicity and Holiness are the necessary properties of the Church of Christ.**

1148. *Catech. Conc. Trid., In Symbolum* a.9 c.14-19; S.Th., *In Symbol.* C.12; Suarez, *De fide* d.9 a.5-7; Mazzella, th.2731; Palmieri, *Proleg. de Ecclesia* § 48-52; Van Laak, *De Eccles.* 238-293; De Groot, q.5 a.1-5; Straub, th.31-37; Ottiger, th.9-12; Billot, q.2-6; De San, n.110-123, 142-158, 172-184, 190-197; Muncunill, n.179-230; Dorsch, t.38-43; Van Noort, *De Eccles.* N.101-122; Bainvel, *De Ecclesia* th.3-10; De Guibert, th.11-14; Lercher, th.43; Zapelena, th.11f.; Y. de la Briere, *Eglise*: DAFC 1,1277-1289; C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa e le Chiese* 42-61.

1149. Connection. From the proved divine institution and perpetuity of the Church with the Hierarchy and Primacy, we concluded rightly that the true Church of Christ is the Roman Catholic Church alone. But now, after having proved the distinct visibility of the Church of Christ, we progress further by asking what the properties are by which the true Church of Christ is distinguished from the false ones.

1150. Preliminary note. The doctrine on the properties distinguishing the Church of Christ was already suggested by the holy Fathers, but it has really been developed since the 16th century. From the Fathers, the authors appeal to St. Irenaeus against the *Gnostics* for the *Apostolicity of succession*, to St. Cyprian against the *Novatians* for *Unity*, to St. Pacianus against all the heretics for *Catholicity*, and to St. Augustine against the *Manicheans* for *Holiness*.¹ Against the *Protestants* several properties are mentioned to distinguish the true Church. Thus, M. de Medina assigns ten, Sanderus twelve, Bozius a hundred, St. Bellarmine fifteen, which however he says can be reduced to the four that are professed in the Creed.² This *number of four Notes* began in the 16th century and evolved in the 17th century, but it was fully established in the 19th and 20th centuries (D 2886-2888).³ This argumentation from the properties and Notes was used from the beginning and always to illustrate and confirm faithful Catholics, or to

1. St. Irenaeus, *Adv. haeres.* 3: R 209-13; St. Cyprian, *De cathol. Ecclesiae unitate*: R 555-57; St. Pacianus, *Epist.* 1

c.4: R 1243; St. Augustine, *De moribus Ecclesiae* 1.1: ML 32,1309-44.

2. M. de Medina, *De recta in Deum fide* 1.7 c.26; Sanderus, *De visibili monarchia Ecclesiae* 1.7 (1571) 237-49; Bozius, *De signis Ecclesiae* (1591); St. Bellarmine, *Controv.* 4, 1.4 *De Notis Ecclesiae* c.3-18. See S.Th., *In Symbolum*, c.12: Ed. Vivès, 27 p.222.

3. See de Guibert, n.107; Zapelena, th.13 scholia 1 and 3 p.471 and 481; G. Thils, *Les Notes de l'Eglise* (1937).

convince heretics and schismatics, who still retained true faith in Christ; but for those who lack a true faith in Christ this proof is not thought to be effective. Hence another demonstration from the moral miracle of the Church, which of itself is efficacious to persuade all who consider it, has been cultivated since the 19th century and it is recommended by *Vatican Council I* (D 3013-3014).⁴

1151. Definition of terms. A *property* is that which is thought to pertain to some thing. An *accidental* property is that which inheres in something contingently by way of an accident. An *essential* one is that which flows from the nature of the thing and inheres in it necessarily.

Since the whole reality of the Church comes from the positive will of Christ, therefore the *necessary properties of the Church* are those that belong to it inseparably from the institution of Christ, whether they flow from its nature or from its causes.

Many can be assigned that are deduced from the social and supernatural nature of the Church and from its causes. Here we are considering only the four that we profess in the Creed. All theologians, both *Catholic* and oriental *Schismatic*, think that they are absolutely *necessary* and *essential*.

1152. Doctrine of the Church. That those four properties of the Church are necessary is clear from the faith expressed in the Creeds.

The Apostolic Creed (2nd cent.): D 11, 30, 41 (Holy, Catholic, One, Apostolic Church)

Nicene-Constantinople (381): D 150 (U.S.C.A.).

Leo IX to Antioch (1053): D 684 (S.C.A.U.).

Profession of Faith for Waldensians (1208): D 792 (U.S.C.A.).

Council of Lyons (1274): D 854 (S.C.A.U.).

Bull "Unam Sanctam" (1302): D 870 (U.S.C.A.).

Creed of the Council of Trent (1546-1564) D 1500, 1862 (U.S.C.A.).

Vatican Council I (1870): D 3001 (S.C.A.R.); D 3013-3014 (S.C.U.).

In the revised Outline *On the Church*, in *Vatican I* cn.16: "If any one denies that the Roman Church alone is the true Church of Christ, One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic, let him be anathema" (Msi 53,317).

1153. Theological note. Therefore it is an *Article of divine and Catholic Faith* to be professed by all that the Church necessarily and indefectibly is One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic.

4. See Vacant, *Etudes théologiques sur les Constit. du Vatican* n.700-720. We will consider this type of demonstration in the *Excursus* in n. 1276f.

1154. I. Unity is a necessary property of the Church (see Leo XIII: D 3302).

Definition of terms. *Unity* is the property by which something is undivided in itself and divided from everything else. Therefore unity excludes the inner division of the thing and does not allow it to be a part of some other whole thing.

Social unity, which we are considering, is the working together of several persons for an end, under a supreme social power.

In the Church a *threefold* social unity is distinguished: *of faith, government and worship*, “of minds, wills and things to do,” as Leo XIII says in the *Encyclical “Satis cognitum”*: D 3305.

Unity of faith is the agreement of minds in the same profession of faith, under the supreme Magisterium of the Church.

Unity of government is the agreement of wills working for the same social end under the supreme power of the Church of ruling.

Unity of worship is harmony in the celebration of sacrifice and in the use of the sacraments and of liturgical acts, under the supreme power of the Church of sanctifying.

1155. Subjection to the supreme power of teaching, ruling and sanctifying, instituted by Christ, is required and sufficient in order to achieve this threefold social unity. However, *if we suppose the Primacy*, this power will be monarchic, but *if we prescind from the Primacy*, it will be oligarchical, or the College instituted in the Apostles, which continues perpetually in the Bishops as the successors of the Apostles.

Unity of law is the power, conferred on the Church by Christ, of demanding authoritatively from men that stated threefold unity.

Unity of fact is the same threefold unity, to which men are obliged, required *de facto* from the members of the Church.

1156. Adversaries. a) All those who call themselves Christian and defend the autonomy of independent sects deny the *unity of government*.

Thus the *Oriental*s, especially those who advocate *self-governing* Churches, say: “the domains of the Church do not reach up to heaven.”⁵

Also all *Protestants* and *Anglicans*, from whose principles so many national Churches were born or at least independent Christian sects, which refuse to admit the unity of a universal government.

5. Fr. Grivec, *Acta IV Conventus Velehradensis* (1925) 61, attributes this sentence to Plato Kijovenski; see Fr. Heiler, 227; Sr. Zankow, 61 note 30, says that it is attributed to Philaretus Moskoviensis; see also Fr. Grivec, *Doctrina Byzantina de Primatu et Unitate Ecclesiae* (1951) 57-64.

Contemporary Latitudinarians, who by developing a theory of a broader unity, defended by the Calvinist Jurieu in the year 1686, adhere to the thesis of the *tripartite Church*, advocated by the Anglicans Pusey and Palmer, or they still defend the much broader *panchristian* unity (see D 2885).⁶ See what we said above in thesis 29, n. 1127.

1157. b) *Protestants, Latitudinarians, Rationalists and Modernists* deny the *unity of faith* and consequently of *worship*. The first *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* theoretically held this unity; but because of their principle of the private interpretation of Scripture, many different confessions were born. Hence the Calvinist Jurieu defended the thesis that the unity of faith is required only with regard to the *fundamental articles*.⁷ But since no authority is recognized by them, which could define what those articles are, therefore as a consequence the Latitudinarians now do not require unity in the profession of faith. Finally, *rationalistic Protestants*, like Sabatier and Harnack, content with the internal "religion of the spirit," require absolutely no profession of faith. The *Modernists* agree with them: D 3459.

1158. It is proved that unity is a necessary property of the Church

A. *The unity of the Church from the metaphors of Christ*: see Leo XIII: D 3305.

Christ instituted the Church, a perennial society, as a Kingdom, as a House, as one Flock, as one Body. But a perennial society, built by a most wise Architect according to these images, necessarily will be one. Therefore Unity is a necessary property of the Church.

The major is clear from the theses on the institution of the Church and of the Primacy and of their perpetuity.

The minor. Because according to the teaching of Christ, if it were not one, neither would it be perennial nor that which He himself willed. From Matt. 12:25: *Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste*. From Matt. 12:25: *No city or house divided against itself will stand*. From John 10:16: *I must bring other sheep... and there will be one flock and one shepherd*. From 1 Cor. 12:12: *There is one body... and all the members of the body, though many, are one body: so it is with Christ*.

1159. *Unity of law, from the threefold power of the Church* instituted by Christ. Christ instituted in the College of Apostles the threefold power,

6. D'Herbigny, n.227,5 treats the Anglican Latitudinarians. On the divisions of the Panchristians, the permanent Commission of the World Council of Churches declared in July 1950: "The divisions that exist between the Churches are in contradiction with the nature of the Church": *Irenikon* 24 (1951) 39. The same point was acknowledged by the *Ecumenists* in Evanston in 1954; see n.1127.

7. P. Jurieu, *Le vrai système de l'Eglise* (1686).

which will endure perpetually, of teaching, ruling and sanctifying, and he placed an obligation on men to submit themselves to this power. But the unity of law consists in this, which we explained in the definition of terms. Therefore the Church necessarily will be one, with a unity of law.

The major is clear from the thesis on the institution of the Church: see Matt. 28:18; Mark 16:15; Luke 10:10-16. See thesis 3, n.117-150.

The minor is certain: because if the Apostles and their successors perpetually have the right and obligation of teaching, ruling and sanctifying; and the faithful have the corresponding obligation of believing, obeying and receiving the sacraments; then it follows that in the Church there is indefectibly the threefold unity by right—of faith, government and worship.

1160. C. *Unity of fact, from the priestly prayer of Christ:* John 17:1-26. Christ sought from the Father solemnly, earnestly and for the highest motives, the perfect unity of the Church. But this prayer of Christ could not be inefficacious. Therefore the Church necessarily is one with a unity of fact. But this unity would not be perfect unless it were given also in the essential things. Therefore the Church will be *de facto* one with the unity of faith, government and worship, which are in a special way the essential elements in the Church of Christ.

The major: a) The solemn prayer of Christ to the Father: John 17:1-5. b) Petition of unity for the Apostles: motives and importunity: John 17:6-19. c) Petition of unity for the Church: perfect unity, insistence: John 17:20-26.

1161. D. *Unity of fact and law, from St. Paul:* Eph. 4:1-16. a) *Unity of fact*, from the purpose of the vocation of the faithful: Eph. 4:1-6. According to St. Paul the Christian vocation demands from all in the highest degree unity, both external of the social body and internal of minds, which under one Lord, one faith, one Baptism leads finally to complete subjection to God the Father. Therefore, according to St. Paul, unity of fact is a necessary property of the Church.

b) *Unity of law*, from the purpose of the institution of the ministers of the Church: Eph. 4:11-16.

According to St. Paul, Christ instituted ministers of the Church for the building of the social body, for the unity of faith and for the sanctification of the faithful, in perfect subordination to Christ as the Head. Therefore, according to St Paul the unity of law is a necessary property of the Church.

Note that in St. Paul it is evident from Eph. 4:5 that the *threefold* unity is sufficiently signified both of law and of fact, namely, in faith, in

government and in worship: *one Lord, one faith, on baptism*; Eph. 4:11: *pastors and teachers for the equipment of the saints*. That the sacrament of unity is the Eucharist, consult J. Salaverri, *La Eucaristía, Sacramento de Unión*: EstEcl 26 (1952) 453-465.

1162. E. *Testimonies of the Father on the unity of the Church*. *Didaché* (pt.100); R 6,4; St. Ignatius (ca. 107): R. 56; Hermas (ca. 150): R 93; Hegesippus (ca. 180): R 88; St. Irenaeus (ca. 196): R 192, 241, 257; Tertullian (ca. 200): R 292, 296; Clem. Alex. (ca. 196): R 435; St. Cyprian (251): R 555f., 587; St. Hilary (ca. 358): R 865; St. Optat. Milev. (ca. 370): R. 1242.

1163. II. Catholicity is a necessary property of the Church.

Definition of terms. *Catholicity*, etymologically from καθ' όλον, means universality.

The word does not occur formally, but certainly virtually in the Gospel of Mark 14:9: *Wherever the Gospel is preached in the whole world* εἰς όλον τον κόσμον. The same phrase occurs in Matt. 26:13.

As an epithet of the Church it appears first in St. Ignatius of Antioch (+ 107): *Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 8,2 (R 65,2); "wherever Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholic Church." And later (ca. 157) in the *Martyrdom of St. Polycarp*, from the Church of Smyrna, 1 (R 77): "The Church of God, which is active in Smyrna, to all the parishes in the whole world of the holy and Catholic Church." The same is found in 8 (R 79). Also the faithful at Antioch for the first time were called Christians, Acts 11:26.⁸

1164. *Catholicity in the strict sense* is the wide diffusion of the one Church throughout the world with a conspicuous multitude of members.

This implies two things: 1) as *fundamental*, there is its *unity*; for the Church cannot be said to be spread throughout the world unless it is presupposed to be one; 2) as *formal*, because there is a wide diffusion with a conspicuous multitude of members.

Catholicity of law is the power or right and office divinely given to the Church of gathering to herself all men everywhere on earth. *Catholicity of fact* is the actual great number of members of the Church everywhere on earth.

8. Recall the beautiful saying of St. Pacian: "My name is Christian, but my surname in Catholic: the former names me, but the latter manifests me... Wherefore our people by this appellation are divided from the heretical name, since it is called Catholic": R 1243. See St. V. of Lérins: R 2168; St. Augustine: R 1548, 1580. On the notion of Catholicity, see A. Garciadiego, *Katholiké Ekklesia desde S. Ignacio hasta Origenes* (1953); J. Salaverri, *El dogma de la Catolicidad de la Iglesia y la Espiritualidad misionera*: MisExtr n.12 (1953) 6-32.

1165. *Catholicity of fact* is distinguished in several ways:

a) It would be *physical*, if it included all men everywhere; b) it is *moral*, if it is illustrious with a multitude of men and diversity of places; c) *Moral Catholicity* would be *simultaneous*, if at the same time it were diffused to all and everywhere; d) *Moral Catholicity* is *successive*, if only at successive times it comes to all men everywhere.

Simultaneous moral Catholicity: e) is said to be *temporary*, if it is going to continue for some time; f) it is said to be *perpetual* if, once having been acquired, it is going to continue always in its essentials.

Moral Catholicity of fact: g) is said to be *absolute*, if it pertains to the Church in itself without respect to other societies; h) but it is *relative*, if its catholicity is greater in comparison with that of other Christian societies.

1166. State of the question. We are asserting the full and perfect *Catholicity of law* of the Church; but that the *Catholicity of fact* is not physical, but moral, absolute and relative, simultaneous and perpetual.

1167. The opinions of Catholics on some accidental aspects of this matter.

a) *Catholicity of fact* is asserted: 1) since *the apostolic age*, by Murray, Billot, Van Laak, and others; 2) since *the time of Irenaeus* in the 2nd century (R 192), by Bellarmine, Suarez, Mazzella, and others; 3) it was present *already in the 3rd century*, by Hurter and others; 4) since *the time of Emperor Constantine I* in the 4th century, by Wilmers and others; 5) *imperfect* in the apostolic age, but *perfect since the time of St. Augustine*, by Mendive.⁹

1168. b) *Catholicity of fact*, as a necessary property, is asserted as only successive by Driedo, M. Cano, Bellarmine. By others it is generally held to be *simultaneous*.¹⁰

c) *Catholicity of fact* not only absolute, but *also relative* or in comparison with other Christian sects taken individually is generally asserted, at least as the more probable opinion.¹¹

d) *Catholicity of fact* is said to be *perpetual*, not necessarily physically, but only *morally*, as the more probable opinion, by Suarez, Van Laak and Zapelena.¹²

9. 1) P. Murray, *De Ecclesia* 2,62; L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* q.5 th.6 § 2; Van Laak, *De Ecclesia tractatus dogmaticus* 262f. 2) St. Bellarmine, *Controv. de Ecclesia* 1.4 c.7; Suarez, *De fide* 1.1 c.16 n.9, who is followed by Mazzella, *De Ecclesia* n.698. 3) H. Hurter, *Theol. compend.* 1,309. 4) G. Wilmers, th.92 n.329. 5) J. Mendive, *Instit. Theol.* 1 n.141.

10. Driedo, *De Scriptura et Dogmatibus* 4 c.2; M. Cano, *De Locis* 1.4 c.6 resp. ad 13; St. Bellarmine, *De Eccles.* L.4 c.7.

11. See De Guibert, n.125,3. The following authors seem to hold it as certain: Stapleton, *Principiorum fidei doctr. Demonstratio: Contr.* 1.1.4 c.3f.; Suarez, *Def. fidei* 1.1 c.16 n.19-24; Billuart, *De reg. fidei* diss. 3 a.4 § 2 n.3; Murray, *De Eccles.* 2,69-71; Hurter, th.60; De Groot, q.5 a.4; Wilmers, n.333; Mazzella, n.701; Billot, th.7 § 2; De San, *De Eccles.* N.163-66; Van Laak, *De Eccles. tract. dogmat.* 254-62; Straub, n.1346; Lercher, n. 439. Schultes did not dare to hold this, a. 21 n.4e.

12. Van Laak, *De Eccles.* 251; Zapelena, th.11 schol.1.

1169. Adversaries. 1) All those who do not hold the true *unity* of the Church take away the foundation of true *catholicity*, about which we spoke in the first part. In particular, *Anglicans, Lutherans* and *Calvinists*; contemporary promoters of *Panchristianity*, who want to reserve the name of *Catholicity* for the confederation of all Christian confessions.¹³

2) All Protestants, Anglicans and Schismatics, who are led by their principles logically and de facto, whether willingly or unwillingly, to embrace autonomous *national churches*.

3) Very many *Oriental Schismatics*, who now no longer hold the genuine concept of catholicity. For, setting aside local catholicity, they reduce it to the universalism of all those who, according to their good pleasure, either de facto pertain, or by right ought to pertain to the Church of Christ.¹⁴

1170. Theological note. With the Church we hold as a matter of *Catholic faith* the full and perfect catholicity of right, and also the true moral catholicity of fact. Concerning other points, which are debated among Catholics, we defend our opinion as more probable.

1171. Proof 1) of Catholicity of right.

Christ committed to one Church the right or office of gathering to herself everywhere all men, with the obligation of men corresponding to this right or office. But the catholicity of right consists in this right or office with the corresponding obligation. Therefore the Church necessarily is catholic with a catholicity of right.

The minor is clear from the terms.

The major is proved: a) from Matt. 28:18-20: *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me. Go therefore* (the right and mandate to be exercised everywhere, including the corresponding obligation): *Make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit* (the right to gather together all, at the same time and absolutely): *Teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you* (the right for one Church, because all for all and indeed physically): *And lo, I am with you always, to the close of the age* (perpetual catholicity of right).

The major is proved: b) from Mark 16:15-16.20: *Go into the whole world* (a mandate to be exercised everywhere): *Preach the gospel to the whole creation* (the right to gather all into one Gospel or Church): *He who believes and is baptized will be saved; but he who does not believe will*

13. Fr. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1917) Introduction: The name "Catholic" and its history, 1-19.

14. M. Jugie, *Theol. Orient.* 4,565-72; A. Deubner, *La traduction du mot καθολικὴν dans le texte slave du Symbole*: OrChr 16 (1929) 54-66; B. Schultze, *L'idea di "Sobornost" nella Chiesa russa di oggi*: Documenti e studi di espansione cristiana 5 (1948) 319-350.

be condemned (the obligation corresponding to the right concerning all—physically, at the same time, perpetually and absolutely): *They went forth and preached everywhere, while the Lord worked with them and confirmed the message* (the fulfillment of the mandate with the assistance of the Lord).

1172. Proof 2) of Catholicity of fact.

The Catholicity of fact is the actual large number of members of the Church everywhere morally, simultaneous and perpetual. But from the divine attestation such a large number of members belongs to the Church. Therefore the Church necessarily will be catholic with a catholicity of fact.

The major is the definition of catholicity of fact with its properties.

The minor is proved: A. from Matt. 13:24-30.36-43: *The parable of the weeds. A large number*, because it is like a thick planting growing in a field. *Everywhere*, because the field is the world. *Moral*, because the weeds grow together with the wheat. *Simultaneous*, because it is like one planting. *Perpetual*, because the harvest is the end of the world.

1173. *The minor is proved:* B. from Ps. 72 which, as St. Jerome says, “pertains to the prophecy of Christ and the Church” and is held as messianic by the ancient Jewish interpreters, and also by all the holy Fathers and Christian exegetes. In this Psalm the concern is with Christ the King and with his Kingdom. This is what is asserted: a) *the large number* of subjects (v.11.17) *All nations serve him... May men bless themselves by him, all nations call him blessed*; b) *everywhere* (v. 8.19) *May he have dominion from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth... may his glory fill the whole earth*; c) *moral* v.9.12) *may his enemies lick the dust... for he delivers the needy when he calls*; d) *perpetual* (v.5.7.15.17.20) *may he live while the sun endures throughout all generations... till the moon be no more... may prayer be made for him continually... may his name endure forever... his fame continue as long as the sun*; e) *and simultaneous*, because the great number is everywhere and always (a, b, d).¹⁵

1174. *The minor is confirmed:* C. *The catholicity of fact* is announced prophetically by Christ in Luke 24:46-47: *Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead; and that repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem*; and Acts 1:8: *and you shall be my witnesses in*

15. From Matt. 2:11, compared with Ps. 72:10.15, it can be inferred that Ps. 72 is messianic. See Knabenbauer on Ps. 72. The sense of the verses, which we cite from the Vulgate, agrees with the sense of the new version of the Psalms. See E. Pannier, *Les Psaumes*, in L. Pirot, *La S. Bible*, 5 (1937); E. Kalt, *Die Psalmen*, in Herder's, *Bibelkommentar*, 6 (1937).

Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth; and also in Matt. 8:11; 24:14: And this gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world, as a testimony to all nations; and then the end will come. We find the same catholicity prophetically foretold in Isa. 2:2; Dan. 2:35; 7:14; Zech. 8:10; Mal. 1:11; Ps. 2:8; 22:28; and in other places in the Old Testament.¹⁶

1175. D. *Testimonies of the Fathers on the catholicity of fact: The Church of Smyrna* (ca. 157): R 79; Irenaeus (ca. 180): R 192; *Muratorian Canon* (ca. 200): R 268,55; Cyprian (251): R 556, 587; Cyril of Jerusalem (348): R 838f.; Pacianus ca 390): R 1243; Augustine (ca. 408): R 1422; (ca. 391): R 1548; (393): R 1562; (397): R 1580.¹⁷

1176. III. Apostolicity is a necessary property of the Church.

Definition of terms. *Apostolicity fundamentally* is the perennial identity in the Church of the mission, which Christ gave the Apostles when he instituted the Church. Apostolicity usually is distinguished into at least three forms:

1) *Of origin*, which is the essential identity, not only specific but also individual of the constitution of the contemporary Church with that which took its beginning with the Apostles and from the Apostles.

2) *Of doctrine*, which is the objective and individual identity of the doctrine of the contemporary Church with the deposit of doctrine received from the Apostles and handed on.

3) *Of succession*, which is the juridical identity of the power of teaching, sanctifying and ruling of the contemporary Church with the ordinary power of the Apostles handed on by a legitimate succession.

1177. To the identity 1) *of origin* there is no obstacle in the accidental modifications by which particular Churches are endowed so that the Church of Christ can accommodate itself to all and so enrich all. To the identity 2) *of doctrine* further declarations are not opposed whereby the Church explains the deposit and adapts it to our understanding. To the identity 3) *of succession* determinations of ecclesiastical law are not opposed, since they are established for a more suitable application of the divine law.

16. See Zapelena, th.11,2 p.412.

17. See Ottiger, 2,450-54. St. Ambrose, *In Luc.* L.9 n.29: "In the Church of God there is equal treatment and no discrimination between poor and rich, the humble and the powerful, slaves and lords": ML 15,1800. On the relation of catholicity to the missions to unbelievers, see Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, 2,1207-1252; J. Salaverri, *El dogma de la Catolicidad y la espiritualidad misionera*: MisExtr n.12 (1953) 6-32.

1178. From the hierarchical constitution of the Church it is inferred that the apostolicity both of origin and of doctrine necessarily is included under the apostolicity of succession in the power of teaching, ruling and sanctifying.

The apostolicity of succession is distinguished in two ways: 1) *material*, is the mere continuation of one person after another in the same office, without a necessary permanence of the same law; 2) *formal*, is the replacement of one person in the rights and obligations of another in some office, without any change in the law.

Apostolicity of formal succession is, therefore, that apostolicity of succession defined previously under 3); this will be *direct*, if by an uninterrupted succession it goes back to a certain Apostle, the first pastor of the same Church; but it will be *indirect*, if the first in the series of successors properly received his jurisdiction from the pastor of another Church, who can legitimately confer it.

1179. Adversaries. 1) *Evolutionists*, both *rationalist* and *modernist*, deny utterly to the Church all apostolicity; for, they say that the Church is subject to the law of evolution in all things (see D 3453-3465).

2) *Protestants*, *Latitudinarians* and *Panchristians* do not hold for the apostolicity of doctrine, because, following Jurieu, they require identity and unity of doctrine only in a few essential dogmas, or they think that no identity of doctrine is necessary: see above n. 1157.

3) Those who, following Marsilius of Padua, attack a hierarchy divinely instituted in the Church, deny totally the apostolicity of succession, or they explain it in such a way that they are content with a merely material succession, like the *Anglicans* and many *Schismatics*, or finally they maintain, like the *Protestants*, that the apostolic succession is not a necessary property of the Church.¹⁸

1180. The apostolicity of formal succession is proved, in which others are included.

A. What Christ instituted perpetually in the Church is its necessary property. But Christ instituted perpetually the juridical identity of the power of the Church of all ages with the ordinary power of the Apostles, to be handed on by a formal succession. Therefore the apostolicity of formal succession is a necessary property of the Church.

18. Consult the opinions of the adversaries of Apostolicity: 1) of the *Rationalists* in thesis 3, n.124-27; 2) of the *Latitudinarians* among the adversaries in the preceding part of this thesis; 3) of the *Protestants* in thesis 3, n.123; 4) of the *Schismatics* in Jugie, 4,574-77.

The consequence is clear, because the minor is the definition of the apostolicity of succession. *The major* is certain, because it is the definition of a necessary property.

The minor is explained: 1) Christ established the juridical identity of power, because he conferred on the Apostles no other power except his own mission, and as one destined to endure perpetually, as was already proved from John 17:18; 20:21; Matt. 28:18-20; John 14:16.26.

The minor is explained: 2) The identical power of the Apostles is to be handed on perpetually by formal succession, because perpetuity is promised by Christ to the same Apostles: Matt. 28:20; John 14:16; but not to the same persons physically; therefore to the same ones morally or juridically, that is, without any change of law, or by formal succession.

1181. B. St. Irenaeus and Tertullian say that formal succession from the Apostles is a distinctive property of the Church; therefore it is also necessary. The antecedent was already proved in thesis 8 on the successors of the Apostles. See R 209-213, 292f., 296-298, 341. See St. Cyprian: R 589.

1182. IV. Holiness is a necessary property of the Church.

Definition of terms. *Holiness* especially belongs to God, who is called in Rev. 4:8 and Isa. 6 *Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God*.

Since it belongs to God, according to Pseudo-Dionysius, "*Holiness* is free from all evil, both absolutely perfect and in every way immaculate purity." With this definition holiness, which is substantial in God, is described; therefore St. Thomas says: by this holiness "the purity of divine goodness is signified."¹⁹

Holiness also pertains to created things by participation, that is, from their dedication to God or by various forms of union with God, since he is the first principle of all and the last end of the economy of supernatural salvation. This participated holiness is distinguished in two ways:

1) That holiness is *ontological* which belongs to things as such; 2) *Moral* holiness is that which belongs to persons as such, namely, by reason of their human or moral acts.

1183. 1) *Ontological holiness* pertains to the Church necessarily for many reasons:

a) by reason of her most holy Author and Head, who is *Christ*; b) by

19. Ps.-Dionys., *De divinis nominibus* c.12 n.2: MG 3,970; S.Th., I, q. 36, a. 1 ad 1; II-II, q. 81, a. 8; see L. Lercher, *Instit.* 3 n.90; St. Ambrose: "He is alone holy of all those born of woman—the Lord Jesus," *In Luc.* 2:19: ML 15,1573.

reason of her quasi-soul or principle of life, who is the *Holy Spirit*; c) by reason of her end, which is the sanctification and salvation of men; d) by reason of the means, which are the doctrine of faith and morals, her laws and precepts, sacrifice and sacraments; e) by reason of the fruits, which are grace, virtues and charisms. Now all of these are holy.

1184. 2) *Moral holiness* also pertains necessarily to the Church by reason of her members. *Moral holiness* is a virtue, by which the mind, freed from all impurity, "firmly applies itself and its acts to God."²⁰ Therefore it implies two things: *purity from sins* and *a firm union of the mind with God*; and it can be either *actual* or *habitual*, according as it is had by way of an act or by way of a habit.

Three grades of *moral holiness* are usually designated:

a) *Ordinary holiness*, which implies the absence of mortal sin and flight from it, with grace and the observance of the commandments.

b) *Perfect holiness*, which implies the absence of mortal sin and flight from venial sins, with grace and the observance of the counsels.

c) *Heroic holiness* is perfect holiness, which excels in the smallest and especially in difficult things.

1185. State of the question. That ontological holiness necessarily belongs to the Church is clear from what was said under 1). That the Church is necessarily holy with moral holiness we assert in this sense, inasmuch as among the members of the Church necessarily there will always be holy ones: a) some, with heroic holiness, b) many, with perfect holiness, c) most, with ordinary holiness.

1186. Adversaries. 1) *By excess rigorists, pessimists and puritans* are opposed to the thesis, because they demand that the members of the Church, all of them and they alone, be saints. We covered this matter in thesis 27 on the members of the Church. The main ones among these are the *Novatians*, *Donatists*, *Fraticelli*, *Wycliffe*, *Hus*, and also the *Jansenists* like *Quesnel*, and the *Synod of Pistoia* (see D 911, 1165, 1186, 1212, 1216, 1230, 2473-2478, 2615).

2) *By defect Protestants* are opposed, since they hold that, by the imputation alone of the justice of Christ, men are justified by fiducial faith alone without works (D 1561-5164); therefore they pervert the concept itself of holiness. *Protestants* do away with the *ontological* holiness of the

20. S.Th., II-II, q. 81, a. 8. See I. Solano: SThS III 1,231-234. See J. Salaverri, *La divina y lo humano en la Iglesia*: EstEcl 27 (1953) 167-201.

Church, since they either distort or deny the nature and efficacy of the sacraments and of the Eucharistic sacrifice (D 1601ff.).

3) *The Orientals* are more involved in explaining the ontological holiness of the Church, and they are often silent about her moral sanctity.²¹

1187. We prove that moral holiness is a necessary property of the Church.

A. On ordinary moral holiness.

a) *From the active ontological holiness of the Church.* For many reasons the Church is *ontologically and actively* holy. But the fruits of at least ordinary moral holiness necessarily must respond to the ontological and active holiness in the Church. Therefore the Church necessarily is holy with at least ordinary moral holiness.

The major is clear from the notions under 1): From her Head, Soul, sacrifice, sacraments, virtues, gifts etc. whereby the holiness of the members of the Church is brought about.

The minor is certain from the necessary similitude between the effect and the cause, which if it were not present, the Church would not have a sufficient reason for its existence, as the Lord himself says in Matt, 7:17-19.

1188. b) *From the end of the Church.* The end of the Church is the supernatural salvation of men, which cannot be obtained except by at least ordinary holiness. But the end of the Church, instituted by a most prudent author, necessarily must be obtained. Therefore the Church necessarily will be holy with at least ordinary moral holiness.

The minor can be confirmed *from the parable of the sower*, in which is announced the fruit of a hundred-fold, or sixty, or thirty, of those who have been sown in good soil in the Kingdom of God: Matt. 13:23.

1189. B. *On perfect moral holiness. From the proper nature of the Law of the New Testament.* The proper end of the New Law, as contrasted with the Old, is perfect moral holiness. But such an end must be obtained unfaithfully. Therefore the Church unfaithfully will be holy also with perfect moral holiness.

The major is proved from the perfection added to the Old Law by Christ in establishing the New Law: Matt. 5:17-20.21ff.27ff.33ff.38ff.43ff. This is confirmed from Matt. 19:16-25, where the perfection is expressed which Christ demands of those who follow him, and it is explained: *If you would*

21. See Jugie, 4,540-46; Spacil, *Concep. Eccl. iuxta Orient.* N.77-80.

be perfect, go, sell what you possess and give to the poor... and come, follow me.

The minor from what Christ commanded "to observe everything that he ordered the Apostles to do," and to this he added the promise: *Behold, I am with you*: Matt. 28:19f. Therefore the power will never be lacking efficaciously to obtain the moral perfection, which Christ willed and commanded to be observed in the Church; and consequently perfect holiness will also be found unfailingly in the Church.

1190. C. On heroic moral holiness.

a) *From the fact that Christ willed the Church as a Spouse worthy of himself*: Eph. 5:23-30. The Church is shown as the Spouse of Christ, which the Lord loves, nourishes and fosters, so that he may make her absolutely holy and worthy of himself. But the Church would not be absolutely holy as a Spouse worthy of Christ, unless she also responded with heroic sanctity to the heroic love with which the Lord handed himself over for her. Therefore the Church necessarily will be holy also with heroic moral holiness.

1191. b) *From the precept and example of heroic charity given to the Church by Christ*: 1 John 3:16: *By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren*. From this we argue: Christ gave an example of and precept of heroic charity, as a characteristic of his Church, and he predicts that it is de facto going to be fulfilled. Therefore the Church unfailingly will be holy also with heroic holiness.

The antecedent. The example and precept of heroic charity as characteristic: John 13:34f.; 15:9-20. De facto it is predicted to be fulfilled: John 16:1-4.20.33. And it is not restricted to the Apostles alone: from John 3:16 and from 1 Pet. 2:21. The *antecedent* can also be proved from Matt. 10:17f.24-28, where Christ requires of his own that for the sake of his name they will suffer persecution and death.

1192. D. *Testimonies of the holy Fathers concerning the moral holiness of the Church*. Letter to Diognet. 5,8-16: R 97; Aristides, *Apol.* 15: R 112; Justin, *Apol.* 1,14: R 118; Theophil. *Ad Autolyc.* 3,15: R 186; Irenaeus, *Adv. haer.* 3,24,1: R 226; Min. Felix, *Octav.* 31: R 271; Tertull., *Apologet.* 38f.: R 280f.; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 1,26; 3,29: R 516, 525; Adamantius, *Dialogus* 5:28: R 544; Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* 5,13,11ff.: R 640; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catechesis* 18,23: R 838.²²

22. For several other testimonies of the Fathers, see Straub, n.1323-25, 1331-34.

1193. Objections.²³ A. *Against unity.* 1. Unity, which Christ recommends in John 17:21-23, like perfection which he recommended in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. 5:28, is an ideal model proposed to the Church from outside. But such a model, as extrinsic to the Church, cannot be her necessary property. Therefore the unity which Christ recommended for the Church is not her necessary property.

I distinguish the major. The unity which Christ recommended for the Church is an ideal model that is purely theoretical, *denied*; practical, *I subdistinguish*: which the Church, aided by the grace of God, truly always can imitate and de facto does imitate, *conceded*; which in its whole ideal perfection must not or cannot be fulfilled by the Church, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor*: Such a model, as theoretical, cannot be a property of the Church, *conceded*; as practical, *I subdistinguish*: it cannot be a property of the Church since it cannot be fulfilled in its whole ideal perfection, *conceded*; since it is truly imitable and de facto is imitated, *denied*.

1194. 2. Where two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ, Christ is there in their midst: Matt. 18:20. But where Christ is, there is the Church. Therefore in order to have unity of the Church, any gathering in the name of Christ suffices.

According to the context of the quoted text, *I distinguish the major*: Where two or three are gathered together to pray in the name of Christ, Christ is present there hearing their prayer, *conceded*; Christ is present there precisely as Head of his constituted Mystical Body, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor*: Where Christ is precisely as the Head of his constituted Mystical Body, there is the Church, *conceded*; where Christ is merely as hearing the prayers of those invoking him, there is the Church, *denied*. For, in the house of Cornelius before he was baptized, Christ was truly present hearing the prayers of that family: Acts 10; however, the Church was not there, because they had not yet been baptized.

1195. 3. *For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body... and all were made to drink of one Spirit*: 1 Cor. 12:13. But unity, whose cause and principle is one Spirit, must be said to be internal and spiritual. Therefore the unity of the Church is internal and spiritual.

With eyes on the text itself, *I distinguish the minor*: Unity whose cause and animating principle is the one Spirit, primarily and principally must be said to be internal and spiritual, *conceded*; it must be said to be purely internal and spiritual, *I subdistinguish*: if it positively excludes the visible unity of the Body, *conceded*; if it also brings with itself the visible unity of the Body, *denied*. For, Paul expressly says: *we were all baptized INTO ONE BODY*, in which the visibility is expressed. Likewise *I distinguish the consequent*.

1196. 4. *Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for (ἅπαρ) we all partake of the one bread*: 1 Cor. 10:17. Hence, the cause and reason for the unity of the visible Body of the Church is participation in one and the same Eucharistic bread.

23. See Zapelena, 417-424; Muncunill, n.189-192.205f.218-222.230; Dorsch, 578f..605.614; D'Herbigny, n.210.235.260; De Guibert, n.118.126.130.136.

Therefore unity at least of faith and government is not required.

I distinguish the antecedent. The exemplary cause and the symbolic reason for the unity of the visible Body of Christ is participation in one and the same Eucharistic bread, *conceded*; the adequate cause and sufficient reason for the unity of the Body of the Church is such participation, *denied*. You will find the reason for this distinction in the *Council of Trent*: D 1649-1650, and in Saints Chrysostom and Augustine: R 1194, 1519, 1824. See J. Salaverri, *Sacramento de unión*: EstEcl 26 (1952) 453-465.

1197. 5. As is certain from thesis 18, in scholium 1, there is in the Church a true dogmatic progress, in virtue of which what is believed cannot always be one and the same. But the unity of faith depends on the unity of what is to be believed. Therefore in the Church there cannot be a true unity of faith.

I distinguish the major. Objectively, *denied*; subjectively, *I subdistinguish*: in virtue of which what is believed explicitly cannot be one and the same, *conceded*; implicitly, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way*; *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

1198. B. *Against catholicity.* 6. *A chosen race and fellow citizens with the saints*: 1 Pet. 2:9; Eph. 2:19, belong to the Church. But *Few are chosen* and *Few are those who find the narrow way that leads to life*: Matt. 7:14; 20:16. Therefore the Church is not for the many or catholic.

I distinguish the major. Those belonging to the Church are a chosen race for grace and fellow citizens with the saints with a holiness which can progress, *conceded*; they are a chosen race precisely for glory and fellow citizens with the saints with a consummated holiness, *I subdistinguish*: they belong to the triumphant Church in heaven, *conceded*; militant on earth, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way*; *I deny the consequent and the consequence*.

1199. 7. A necessary property of the Church can never be absent from her. But catholicity of fact was lacking at the beginning, since the Church was "a little flock" (Luke 12:32), and it will be lacking at the end, when "the Son of man coming will not find faith on earth" (Luke 18:8). Therefore catholicity of fact is not a necessary property of the Church.

I distinguish the major. But in that grade that corresponds to the different stages of development of the Church, by an analogy with the human body, to which Christ compared it, *conceded*; in the same invariable grade of perfection always, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Catholicity of fact was lacking at the beginning and will be lacking at the end, in that grade of perfection that corresponds to an organism perfectly developed and fully vigorous, *conceded*; in that grade corresponding to a newly-born and adolescent organism, or approaching its end, *denied*.

1200. 8. Harnack says that all the words signifying universalism and Catholicism are not the statements of Christ, even though they are placed in his mouth by the Evan-

gelists. Therefore according to him, it is not Christ but the Evangelists who desired the catholicity of the Church.

I deny the antecedent. For 1), what Harnack asserts gratuitously, is rightly denied by us; 2) what Harnack asserts cannot be reconciled with the genuineness, veracity and integrity of the Gospels which were already proved in the preceding treatise.²⁴

1201. C. Against apostolicity. 9. The words of Christ, from which we argue, surely prove that only those Apostles who, having left everything, followed Christ, accepted Christ's mission directly and immediately; they also prove that this mission of Christ is to be perpetuated until the end of the world. But for this, formal succession is not necessary nor is it sufficient, but only what is required and suffices is that there are always emulators of the Apostles who, having left everything, dedicate themselves totally to the mission of continuing the work of Christ. Therefore from the words of Christ the Lord it is not proved that apostolicity of formal succession is a necessary property of the Church.

I concede the first part of the major, but I distinguish the second part. They also prove that Christ's mission is to be perpetuated by those who in no true way can be said to be *the Apostles themselves, denied*; by those who in a true way can be said to be *the Apostles themselves, I subdistinguish*: who can be said to be the Apostles themselves at least morally and juridically, *conceded*; who can be said to be the Apostles themselves personally and physically, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* In order for the mission of Christ to be perpetuated in those who in no true way can be said to be the Apostles themselves, emulators of the Apostles continuing the work of Christ are sufficient, *conceded*; the emulators of the Apostles suffice so that Christ's mission is perpetuated in those who can be said to be the Apostles themselves morally and juridically, *I subdistinguish*: if they have formal succession from the Apostles, *conceded*; without such formal succession, *denied*. The reason for this distinction is taken from what Christ says directly and immediately to the Apostles themselves: "As the Father has sent me I also send you"; "Behold, I am with you always, to the close of the age." Therefore the promises were made to the Apostles *themselves*, and to the end of the world they will be fulfilled in *them* at least morally and juridically, that is, in their formal successors.

1202. 10. The Church of Christ is the one in which fruitfully and efficaciously are exercised the powers received from the Apostles of teaching, sanctifying and ruling men. But these powers fruitfully and efficaciously are exercised in the Church which lacks a formal succession. Therefore apostolicity of formal succession is not a necessary property of the Church.

I distinguish the minor. These powers fruitfully and efficaciously are exercised in a Church which lacks formal succession in the power of Orders, *denied*; which lacks formal succession in the power of jurisdiction, *I subdistinguish*: they are exercised fruitfully and efficaciously in virtue of at least implicit delegation or supplying of the

24. For more on these particular points, see D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.250.

one who truly has formal succession, *conceded*; without this at least implicit delegation or supplying, *denied*.

1203. 11. From St. Paul: *You are... built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the cornerstone. His gifts were that some should be Apostles, some Prophets... for building up the body of Christ:* Eph. 2:20; 4:11. From these words this argument is made: The Church of Christ with equal right is built on the Apostles and on the Prophets. But the Church built immediately on the Prophets does not need the apostolicity of succession, but obtains prophetic succession which suffices. Therefore the apostolicity of succession is not a necessary property of the Church of Christ.

I distinguish the major. But in such a way that the Prophets necessarily work with and are subject to the Apostles, *conceded*; without such coordination and subordination, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; I deny the consequent and the consequence.* The reason for this distinction is taken from the known teaching of St. Paul, whereby he shows us that all the charismatics of the Church are in perfect coordination and subordination with reference to the Apostles.

1204. D. *Against holiness.* 12. Moral holiness is the fruit of freedom. But the fruits of freedom are not necessary. Therefore moral holiness is not a necessary property of the Church.

I distinguish the major. Moral holiness is the fruit of the freedom of men with the efficacious assistance of God, *conceded*; without God's efficacious assistance, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way.* The fruits of freedom independently of the efficacious assistance of God are not necessary, *conceded*; dependently on the efficacious assistance of God, *I subdistinguish:* they are not necessary with the antecedent necessity of the freedom of exercise, *conceded*; they are not necessary with the consequent necessity of the freedom of exercise, *again I subdistinguish:* they are not necessary with logical necessity, in virtue of which, while the freedom of the creature is totally protected, they are infallibly obtained by the efficacious providence of God, *denied*; they are not necessary with physical necessity, in virtue of which the efficacious providence of God necessarily would determine the creature to one thing, *conceded*.

1205. 13. Christ proposed moral holiness as a model, but he did not promise his efficacious providence to obtain it. But without the efficacious providence of God the Church cannot unfailingly be holy. Therefore moral holiness cannot be said to be a necessary property of the Church.

I distinguish the major. To obtain moral holiness Christ did not promise his efficacious providence in explicit and express words, *I bypass the major*; but at least implicitly he did not promise it truly and certainly, *denied*. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; I deny the consequence and the consequent.*

14. The perfect holiness of the Church depends on the observance of the evangelical counsels. But Christ did not will that absolutely and efficaciously, because he did not

command it. Therefore he did not will perfect holiness absolutely and efficaciously, and so it is not a necessary property of the Church.

I distinguish the minor. Christ did not will absolutely and efficaciously to demand the observance of the counsels from each and every believer, *conceded*; from the Church herself, and so from the faithful taken in a general and indeterminate way, *denied*.

1206. 15. A necessary property of the Church must be predicated of all those who truly are members of the Church. But moral holiness cannot be predicated of sinners who nevertheless are truly members of the Church. Therefore moral holiness is not a necessary property of the Church.

I distinguish the major. It must be predicated in a general and indeterminate way of all those who are truly members of the Church, *conceded*; it must be predicated in a determinate way and individually of all the persons who truly are members of the Church, *I subdistinguish*: if it were a property which is predicated of the Church by reason precisely of her individual members, from whom it could not be lacking, *conceded*; otherwise, *denied*. Thus, the Church can be said to be reborn by Baptism by reason of the individual members, from each one of whom the baptismal regeneration cannot be lacking. *I distinguish the minor in the same way; I deny the consequent and the consequence.*

1207. 16. For moral holiness to be predicated of the Church as a necessary property, it is required simply that her members be holy. But the major part of the members of the Church are or can be sinners. Therefore moral holiness cannot be predicated of the Church as her necessary property.

I distinguish the major. For moral holiness to be a necessary property of the Church it is required simply that her more devout members, or those who truly adhere to her and participate in her life, be holy precisely because they so adhere to her and participate in her life, *conceded*; it is required simply that her poorer members, or those who neither truly adhere to the Church nor fully participate in her life be holy, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Sinners are a major part of the members of the Church, but the poorer part and therefore precisely sinners because they neither truly adhere to the Church nor fully participate in her life, *conceded*; sinners are the better part of the Church, which truly adheres to the Church and participates fully in her life, *denied*. And given these distinctions, *I deny the consequent and the consequence.* The reason for this distinction is that the Church is, according to the teaching of St. Paul and of Christ himself, something like an organism. Now an organism is said to be simply healthy, if its more important organs are healthy, even if inferior organs are infirm. Again, a tree is named for its real fruits, namely from those that are obtained mature precisely because they cling to the tree and participate fully in its life; but it is not named from the defective fruit which has participated imperfectly in the life of the tree.²⁵

25. See J. Salaverri, *Lo divino y lo humano en la Iglesia*: EstEcl 27 (1953) 167-201; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné*, 2,893-934, 1115-1129.

1208. 17. A thing is good from its whole reality, but bad from any defect. But in the Church there are many defects of sinners. Therefore the Church must be said to be bad rather than good.

I distinguish the minor. Sins are properly a defect of the Church, *denied*; they are rather a defect of the members of the Church, *I subdistinguish*: they are defects of the members of the Church as departing voluntarily from the perfect nature of a member and as removing themselves from the vital influence of the Church, *conceded*; they are defective members of the Church as such and as removing themselves from the vital influence of the Church, *denied*. *The same distinction applies to the consequent; I deny the consequence.*

ARTICLE III

NOTES DISTINGUISHING THE TRUE CHURCH

Thesis 31. Unity, Catholicity, Apostolicity and Holiness are also the Notes which pertain to the Roman Church alone, and therefore distinguish her as the true Church of Christ from the false ones.

1209. St. Augustine, *Contra epist. fundamenti* c.4 n.5: R 1580; St. R. Bellarmine, *Controv.* 4 1.4 *De Notis Ecclesiae*; Suarez, *De fide* d.9 s.9; Mazzella, th.36; Wilmers, t.83-106; Palmieri, *De Rom. Pont. Appendix*; De Groot, q.6f.; Billot, q.2-6; Van Laak, *De Eccles.* 295-308, 326-370; De San, n.124-141, 159-171, 198-213; Van Noort, n.123-149; Michelitsch, § 181-197; Bainvel, th.3-10; Straub, th.38f.; Ottiger, th.15-22; Muncunill, n.231-273; Schultes, a.18-28; Dorsch, th.45-47; D'Herbigny, th.17-28; Dieckmann, n.572-598; De Guibert, th.15f.; Lercher, th.44f.; Zapelena, th.13; Y. de la Briere, *Eglise*: DAFC 1,1289-1297; Poulpique, *L'Eglise catholique* (1923); G. Thils, *Les Notes de l'Eglise* (1937); see Zapelena: Greg 19 (1938) 88-109, 445-468; Id., *De Ecclesia* th.13 schol.3; S. Tyszkiewicz, *La sainteté de l'Eglise cristoconforme* (1945); M. Jugie, *Où se trouve le christianisme intégral?* (1947).

1210. Connection. In the preceding thesis we proved that the four attributes of the Church, which are recited in the Creed, are necessary properties of the Church, or which from the institution of Christ cannot be lacking in the true Church. Now we assert further: 1) that these properties are also Notes, or criteria by which the true Church of Christ can be distinguished from the false ones; 2) that the same four Notes pertain to the Roman Catholic Church; 3) that the same four are not found in other Christian societies. Therefore the thesis is presented in three parts.

1211. Definition of terms. *The criteria* of legitimacy of the Church of Christ are the sensible signs whereby the true visible Church is distinguished from the false ones. Some are *accidental*, that is, manifesting her contingently or from the outside, as is the case with miracles. But others are *essential*, that is, necessarily or from within flowing from the thing itself, and then they are called *Notes*, and indeed of the *visible Church as such*.

A *Note*, therefore, of the Church is a necessary and visible property by which the true Church of Christ is distinguished from the false ones. Wherefore it must be characterized by four conditions, namely, it must be: a) *A necessary property*, for otherwise it would not be distinctive of the Church, as something that it could be lacking; b) *Visible*, at least mediately or indirectly, for otherwise it would not distinguish the Church as visible; c) *More known to us than the Church herself* in the concrete as true, for otherwise it would not be a help to recognize the true Church; d) *Easily knowable*, because it must make known the true Church, which

must necessarily be embraced by all.

1212. A Note of the Church is distinguished by the authors in two ways:

a) *Positive*, that is, having an affirming function, it is that by which, when discovered in a Christian society, by that very fact it is known that *it is* the true Church of Christ; therefore it is an *exclusive Note* of the true Church.
 b) *Negative*, that is, having a negative function, it is that by which, when it is discovered to be lacking in a Christian society, by that very fact it is known that *it is not* the true Church of Christ; therefore it is not necessarily an exclusive Note of the true Church. Therefore every necessary property is by that fact her negative Note and vice versa. But every positive Note of the Church is her necessary property, but not vice versa.¹

1213. A necessary property of the Church can also take on and actually in the true Church does take on a *supernatural character*; but the nature of the Notes in the proper sense does not take into consideration this supernatural character. *The nature of a divine seal or of a moral miracle* can be joined to it and de facto in the true Church it is added to the nature of the Notes; but the essence of the notes in the strict sense prescind also from this quality of a divine seal. Therefore the argumentation from the Notes, which we employ in this thesis, differs from the argumentation from the divine seal; we will say something about this in the following Excursus in n.1276f.

1214. We understand the *Roman Church* as the Church dispersed throughout the world, which maintains union and communion with the Roman Church. We are saying that the four Notes of the Creed belong to this Church alone, and by this we intend to signify two things: 1) *positively* that these four Notes de facto are given in the Roman Church; 2) *negatively* that the same four Notes are not given in the other Christian societies, whether schismatic as are the Oriental dissidents, or heretical as are Protestants and Anglicans.

1215. Adversaries.² *Lutheran, Calvinist, Zwinglian and Anglican Protestants* hold that the Notes of the Church are “the pure preaching of the Word of God and the *right* administration of the sacraments.” However, the purity and rectitude, which they propose, are not more known that

-
1. R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* 160f., disagrees with this common teaching of Theologians, because he equates the concept of a Note with the concept of a divine seal when he says: “The Notes are *supernatural facts, signs divinely given* in testimony of the Church...The Notes of the Church are *positive*, which seems to follow from the very notion of the Notes. But a *negative* Note in our matter is *out of the question*.” On the efficacy of the Way of the Notes, see G. Thils, *Les Notes de l'Eglise* (1937); Zapelena: Greg 10 (1938) 88-109, 445-468; E. Valentini, *De firmitate argumenti ex Via Notarum*: Salesianum 1 (1939) 201-218.
 2. D'Herbigny, n.214-219; De Guibert, n.108; Jugie, 4,578-588; T. Spácil, *De Ecclesia iuxta Theol. Orientis separate*: OrCh 2 (1924) 89-91; Zankow, 73-79; Heiler, 545-555; see also Jugie, *Où se trouve le christianisme intégral?* (1947).

the Church herself and they cannot be known certainly except from the doctrinal authority of the Church, which they must presuppose as already known. Therefore they cannot be Notes.³

1216. 2) Earlier *Oriental Schismatics* since the 17th century, when writing about the Notes of the Church, proposed the same ones as the Catholics, and they tried to apply them either to their own Churches or they explained them especially as belonging to the transcendent Church, not to the earthly Church. After Macarius Bulgakov, in the middle of the 19th century, generally they hold that “she is the true Church, which truly and without change preserves the infallible teaching of the ancient universal Church and remains faithful to it in all things.”⁴

It is without doubt that the true Church necessarily and always will teach the doctrine in harmony with the doctrine of the ancient Church, but this agreement cannot be said to be a Note of the Church, because it is not visible, nor easily recognizable, nor better known than the Church herself; for, when a new heresy appears, only from the already known true and infallible Church can it be known with absolute certainty whether or not the new opinion is in harmony with the doctrine of the ancient Church. Furthermore, the Orientals, who are adding such a Note to the Church, gratuitously and falsely assume that the authority of the Church to decide infallibly in disputes over doctrine is restricted to the first seven Ecumenical Councils.

1217. Opinions of Theologians.⁵

1) All hold that the true Church can be distinguished *by the four Notes taken together*.

2) *From the absence* of even one of these Notes, it is held by all that it can be concluded that the society that lacks it is not the true Church of Christ.

3) All also hold that these *four Notes taken singly*, inasmuch as in their concrete existence they bring with themselves the nature of a *divine seal*, are positive Notes.

4) While not considering the nature of a divine seal, but included in the unity and *Primacy* of apostolicity, the four taken together are accepted by all as positive Notes.

5) Prescinding from the nature of a divine seal and from the Primacy, many hold that the four taken together *are a positive Note* by which the true Church is recognized and it is *by way of assertion*.

6) Abstracting from the nature of a divine seal and from the Primacy, that the four taken together *are equivalent to a positive Note*, inasmuch as they are shown to belong to the Roman Church alone *by the way of exclusion*, is held by almost all.

1218. N.B. *Proof from the Notes by way of assertion* is reduced to this: These four Notes can be found only in the true Church. But *de facto* they are found in the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore only the Roman

3. See D’Herbigny, n.214-219; Dorsch, th.45; Muncunill, n.237-240; Wilmers, th.84; Ottiger, th.14.

4. D’Herbigny, n.218f.; Bainvel, th.3; Schultes, a.18 n.10; Jugie, 4,581-588.

5. Dorsch, 641-53; Zapelena, th.13, school.1-5; Thils, *Les Notes de l’Eglise* (1937).

Catholic Church is the true Church. This is a proof *from the positive Notes* in the strict sense, because in the major proposition is had the definition of a positive Note.

A proof *from the Notes by way of exclusion* is reduced to this: These four Notes cannot be lacking in the true Church. But they are not lacking in the Roman Catholic Church, while they are lacking in all the other Christian societies. Therefore only the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ. This is a proof which proceeds from the definition of a *negative Note*, which is in the major proposition, but *it is equivalent to a demonstration from the positive Notes for the Roman Catholic Church*, because all other Christian societies are excluded.⁶

1219. State of the question. a) We prove that the four properties of the Creed are Notes of the true Church, not under every respect but under a certain respect, that is, we are taking *the unity and catholicity* not of right, but *of fact*; *the apostolicity of succession* not formal, but *material*; *moral holiness* not as internal, but *as evident in good works*. For, under other respects we are not completely certain that they assume the *character of a Note*.⁷

b) *We are not considering the nature of a divine seal* or of a moral miracle, because the proof from the moral miracle of the Church was handled in the preceding treatise and we will touch on it briefly in n.1276f.

c) *We are prescinding from the Primacy*, both because in thesis 11 we have already shown how from it one can conclude that only the Roman Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ, and also because we do not want to drive away heretics and schismatics who believe in Christ, and to whom our thesis is also directed, since there is nothing that they more obstinately deny than the Primacy of the Church

d) Finally, we intend to argue *from the four Notes taken together*, namely, inasmuch as they are shown *by the way of exclusion* to belong to the Roman Catholic Church alone, as we explained in the preceding number.

1220. Doctrine of the Church. a) It was *defined* in Vatican I that the Church is endowed with manifest Notes by which it can be recognized as different (D 3012-3013). b) That the four properties of the Church, which are professed in the Creed, are Notes of the Church, if they are taken together and with the Primacy included in unity, is *Catholic doctrine, from*

6. Zapelena, 472.476.487f.; Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin, Conclusion*, 2: DTC 14, 1466-68.

7. These notions are explained in the preceding thesis.

the Decree "Apostolicae Sedis" addressed to the Bishops of England: D 2886-2888. c) That the same properties taken together, but leaving out the Primacy, are Notes whereby the true Church of Christ can be distinguished from the false ones, is *a doctrine certain in Theology*, from the arguments by which we prove the thesis.

1221. The proof goes like this:

First part. The four properties of the Creed are true Notes (1222).

Second part. *The following belong to the Catholic Church:*

- A. *Unity*, as is certain from the current Code of Canon Law which requires the greatest unity;
- B. *Catholicity*, which the statistics comparing the various Christian confessions make clear;
- C. *Apostolicity*, which is proved by the continuous succession from St. Peter;
- D. *Holiness*, which is proved by:
 - 1) Historical monuments, such as a) Acts of the Councils, b) writings of the holy Fathers, c) the Acts of the Saints;
 - 2) Processes, a) of Beatifications, b) of Canonizations;
 - 3) Institutes of perfection, a) of Priests, b) of Religious (1223-1240).

Third part. *The other Christian confessions lack these Notes* (1241):

A. They lack either *unity* or *catholicity*.

- 1) If the *Protestants* are taken together, they lack unity, if taken singly, they lack catholicity.
 - 1.0 Protestants *taken together* lack unity, a) of government and b) faith, indeed, c) they seek only a certain federation of Churches.
 - 2.0 Protestants taken *singly* lack catholicity, that is, a large diffusion that is a) numerical, geographical, c) perpetual (1242ff.).
- 2) If the *Schismatics* are taken together, they lack unity, if taken singly, they lack catholicity.
 - 1.0 The Schismatics taken together, a) lack unity of *government*, b) they exclude *unity* with their principle of being autocephalous, c) a fortiori those who embrace Panchristianity are opposed to *unity*.
 - 2.0 Taken *singly* the Schismatics lack catholicity, that is, a large diffusion that is a) numerical, b) geographical, c) perpetual (1245f.).

B. *The Note of Apostolicity* is lacking in the other sects.

- 1) They are lacking *the apostolicity of formal succession*.
 - 1.0 Because they lack either unity or catholicity without which there cannot be the apostolicity of formal succession.
 - 2.0 Because they lack a body of Pastors established under a *Primate*, as Christ constituted it in his Apostles: a) *Protestants*, because since the 16th century they have repudiated the Primacy; b) *Schismatics*, because since the 11th century they have denied the Primacy, and indeed contrary to the acknowledgement of the Orientals in the Councils: α) before Photius at Ephesus, Chalcedon and Constantinople III; β) at the time of Photius, at Constantinople IV; γ) for union at Lyons II and Florence (1247ff.).
- 2) *The apostolicity of material succession* in the other sects does not shine as it does in the Catholic Church.
 - 1.0 *Protestants*, a) all lack a See founded immediately by the Apostles; b) *Episcopalians* have only an indirect succession in Orders; c) those who do not acknowledge the episcopacy lack succession absolutely.
 - 2.0 *Schismatics*, a) have some Sees, Antioch and Alexandria, founded by the Apostles, but b) their succession is only indirect.
 - 3.0 The merely material succession in Orders of *Protestants and Schismatics* is not a Note to distinguish the Church, because it can be present among heretics who are outside the true Church (1250-1253).

C. The other sects lack the *Note of holiness*.

- 1) The many sects of *Protestants*:
 - 1.0 *By right*, or according to their principles, ought to lack all Christian holiness.
 - 2.0 *De facto* they lack permanent holiness because of the lack of institutions of perfection.
 - 3.0 *The fruits* of holiness, which they do obtain, are the results of other causes (1254-1258).
- 2) The Churches of the *Schismatics* are lacking in the Note of holiness:
 - 1.0 *The Schismatics with reference to Protestants*: a) Make use of more means of holiness, α) doctrinal, β) liturgical,

- γ) sacramental; b) they obtain more abundant fruits of holiness, α) from the means used, β) from their Priests and Monks, γ) from the acknowledgement and cult of Saints.
- 2.0 *The Schismatics with reference to Catholics:* a) Make use of fewer means of holiness, because they lack, α) universal authority, β) an infallible Magisterium, γ) the fullness of the Sacraments; b) They obtain fewer fruits of holiness, α) in the works of piety, β) in the perfection of the Ministers, γ) in the number and approval of the Saints; c) The means of sanctification, which the Schismatics use, cannot properly be said to be their own, but they belong to the Catholic Church, from which they have been borrowed (1259-1263).

1222. First part. Unity, Catholicity, Apostolicity and Holiness are the Notes by which the true Church of Christ is distinguished.

It is proved from the given notion of a Note. For, these four attributes of the Creed are necessary properties of the Church. But they are also visible, easily recognizable and more known than the Church herself in order to be recognized as true in the concrete. Therefore they are also Notes, by which the true Church of Christ can be distinguished from the false ones.

The major was proved in the preceding thesis.

The minor is clear from the applied notion of a Note to these four properties, if they are taken under that respect which we mentioned in the State of the question. For they are manifestly visible, easily recognizable and more known than the Church herself to be recognized as true in the concrete: a) *Unity of the social fact* of the Church in the profession of faith, in obedience to government and in the offering of worship; b) *Catholicity of the moral fact*, which is the large numerical and geographical diffusion of the faithful of the Church throughout the world; c) *Apostolicity of material succession*, which is a pure continuation of one person after another in the performance of some office; d) *Moral holiness*, which is ordinary, perfect and heroic, because charity is manifested in deeds, with which it is always joined together.

1223. Second part. These four Notes pertain to the Roman Catholic Church.

A. Unity pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

In the Roman Catholic Church all the faithful of the whole world de facto are subordinate to and obey the one supreme power of the Holy

Roman See in the doctrine of the faith, in government and worship, and they do so perfectly and manifestly. Therefore unity pertains perfectly and manifestly to the Roman Catholic Church.

The antecedent is proved from *the Code of Canon Law*, for it is well known that it is in force everywhere and is observed by all; this is also proved from the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, in which the daily and universal exercise of this one authority is shown. For, from the Index alone of the CIC [1917] the following points are clear: 1) *The universal legislative power* which the Holy See exercises (1.1 cn.8-24); 2) *The subject* of this supreme power is *the Roman Pontiff and an Ecumenical Council* subordinate to him (1.2 cn.218-229), but the main organs by which he exercises it are the *Sacred Congregations and Tribunals of the Roman Curia* (1.2 cn.2456-264); 3) Those subject to this power are *all the faithful of the whole world* whether clerics or religious or lay persons (1.2 cn.108-214, 265-725); 4) *The object* of this power is: a) *Sanctification* and divine worship (1.3 cn.731-1321); b) *The Magisterium* and doctrine of the faith (1.3 cn.1322-1408); c) *Administration and governing*, endowed with both judicial and executive power (1.3 cn.1409-1551 and 1.4-5 cn. 1552-2414). Therefore the unity which de facto thrives in the Roman Catholic Church is perfect and manifest, both in Government and in Teaching Authority and in Worship, and indeed existing for many centuries, for the Code of Canon Law was put together especially in order to "gather into one place all the laws of the Church that have been made up to this time."⁸

Therefore concerning the perfect and manifest unity of the Roman Catholic Church, the very clear testimony of St. Irenaeus is proved to be true over and over again down to our own times (R 192).

1224. B. Catholicity pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

A large numerical and geographic diffusion, simultaneous and perpetual, pertains to the Roman Catholic Church, and it is also joined together with great unity. Therefore catholicity de facto manifestly pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

8. Benedict XV, *Const. Apost. "Providentissima Mater Ecclesiae"* among the documents published by way of Introduction to the new CIC [1917]. Although the CIC concerns only the Western Church, it also refers often to the Oriental Church. Recently Pius XII promulgated the ecclesiastical Law, *De disciplina Sacramenti Matrimonii*, and also the *Ius de iudiciis pro Ecclesia Orientali*: AAS 41 (1949) 89-119; 42 (1950) 5-120. The Orientals by their own Right are fully subject to the Roman Pontiff; see E.F. Regatillo, *Institutiones Iuris Canonici* 1 (1946) n.32; Conte a Coronata, *Instit. Iur. Can.* 1 (1948) n.1,I.

The antecedent is very clear from the statistics. The following numbers will suffice.⁹

The number of dwellers on earth is near or surpasses the number of 2,500,000,000. Of those:

<i>According to A. Fischer</i>	<i>Catholics</i>	<i>Protestants</i>	<i>Other Christians</i>
SUM TOTALS.....	400,000,000	208,000,000	179,000,000

Therefore *all Christians* are 787,000,000 = 37% of human beings.

According to Herder from the Encyclopedia Britannica, 1953 edition

<i>Christians</i>	750,292,154	<i>Mohammedans</i>	315,699,603
<i>Catholics</i>	425,508,220	<i>Confucians</i>	300,290,500
<i>Protestants</i>	196,503,520	<i>Buddhists</i>	150,300,00
<i>Orthodox</i>	128,280,414	<i>Hindus-Taoists</i>	330,892,200
<i>Jews</i>	11,532,500	<i>Natural religion</i>	121,150,000
<i>Dwellers on earth</i> ...	2,367,737,000	<i>Without religion</i>	387,579,153

1225. The *catholicity* of the Roman Catholic Church is quite evident from these statistics. For a) *The large numerical diffusion*, both absolute and relative, is obvious, that is, in comparison with the numerical diffusion of the other Christian confessions, even taken all together, which it surpasses; indeed in the world there is no other religion that has so many followers. b) Her great *geographic diffusion*, since she is flourishing in all parts of the world, and in such a way that everywhere it is one and the same and truly supernatural, which really cannot be said about the other Christian confessions.¹⁰ c) This great *diffusion* obviously is *not physical but moral*, because de facto it never physically reaches all men and all places, and because it has suffered not a few variations in the different regions. d) This same *diffusion* is *perpetual and simultaneous*, because after the mature Church obtained it, it has always and at the same time retained down to our own times.

Therefore rightly and deservedly even today we can assert what St.

9. A. Fischer, *Freitag-Berndts Taschenatlas* (1938); A. D'Espierres, *La Religion dans les dif. Pays du monde* (1934); *Herder Korrespondenz*, June 1953, in *DocumCath* 50 (1953) 875; there are other statistics in A. Bouffard, *Prêt-Miss* (1953) 41-105; Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 1, Appendix, 510; D'Herbigny, th.217; C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa e Chiese* 71-74; see L. Hertling, *Numerus christianorum saeculo IV; Numerus Catholicorum inde a saeculo V: ZkathTh* 58 (1934)243-53; 62 (1938) 92-108. For pagans and Christians at the time of Vatican I, see C. Martin, *Conc. Vaticani documentorum collectio* (1873) 169. [Translators note: these numbers pertain to the 1950s.]

10. See D'Herbigny, n.207.

Augustine held in his own time, namely, that the Church is recognized by all because of the Note of catholicity and is distinguished from the heretical or schismatic sects (R 1548).¹¹

1226. C. Apostolicity pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

For, clearly it belongs to the Roman Catholic Church to have the Roman See founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul, where, in a never interrupted series, Bishops directly have succeeded, and from which the other Sees in the whole world have always derived their power, by a succession that is indirectly apostolic (see R 297). But apostolicity of material succession both direct and indirect evidently consist in this. Therefore the apostolicity of material succession evidently and full belongs to the Roman Catholic Church.

1227. Therefore the Roman Catholic Church can with full right extend even to the present day the argument which St. Irenaeus made in the 2nd century, when he said: "The blessed apostles, then, having founded and built up the Church, committed into the hands of Linus the office of the episcopate... To him succeeded Anacletus; and after him, in the third place from the apostles, Clement was allotted the bishopric... In the twelfth place Eleutherius has the bishopric from the Apostles." And in the same way others having succeeded each other without interruption, in the 261st place from the Apostles Pius XII has the episcopacy. "By this ordination and succession, the tradition in the Church from the Apostles and proclaiming the truth has come down to Us. And this showing is most full, that it is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the Church from the Apostles until now and it has been handed down in truth" (R 211; Kch 126).¹²

1228. D. Holiness pertains de facto to the Roman Catholic Church.

We prove from three chapters especially that moral holiness, also perfect and heroic, manifestly pertain to the Roman Catholic Church: 1) from the historical monuments of antiquity; 2) from the processes of the Canonization of Saints; 3) from the permanent Institutes of perfection.

1) We prove especially *from the historical monuments of antiquity* that moral holiness flourished in the Church *before the time of the Oriental schism* (in 865 or 1053; see D 638). a) From the *Acts* of the general and particular *Councils* of the universal Church, which are collected together in chronological order by Mansi in 53 folio volumes, of which the first 19

11. St. Augustine, *De vera Religione*, 7,12; *De fide rerum quae non videntur* 6,7: ML 34,128; 40,176.

12. St. Irenaeus, *Adv. haeres.* 3,3,3: MG 7,849; Tertullian, *De praescriptione haeret.* 32,36,37: ML 2,40,49f.

volumes reach up to the year 1070; b) *From the writings of the holy Fathers*, both Greek and Latin, which Migne collected in chronological order in his *Patrology* of 387 volumes; the first 100 volumes in both series contain what was written before the oriental schism; c) *From the Acts of the Saints*, both martyrs and confessors, which were published by the Bollandists in 65 folio volumes.

1229. Indeed: a) *In the Acts of the Councils* the criteria and norms are presented not only of doctrine, but also of the life of holiness which the faithful were leading; b) *In the writings of the holy Fathers* we have outstanding examples not only of knowledge, but also of their moral perfection in the Church; c) Finally, *in the Acts of the Saints* extraordinary facts are narrated which prove that there were very many Martyrs and Confessors about whose moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, there cannot be any doubt. Therefore from the historical monuments of antiquity it is abundantly clear that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, pertained to the Church *before the time of the schism of the Orientals*. But the Church before the time of the schism of the Orientals was obedient to the Apostolic Roman See and was in communion with it. Therefore from the historical monuments of antiquity it is abundantly clear that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, pertained to the Roman Catholic Church.

1230. 2) *From the processes of the Canonization of Saints* we prove that moral, perfect and heroic holiness flourished in the Roman Catholic Church especially since the end of the 10th century, when the Roman Pontiffs reserved for themselves the definitive decision concerning these cases.

Here are the facts that are presupposed in this argumentation: the Roman Pontiffs, de facto already John XV (985-996), but strictly Alexander III (1159-1181), reserved to themselves the final judgment in the causes of the Saints. After the appearance of Protestantism gradually more strict rules for the processes of the Canonizations of Saints were instituted by Leo X (1513-1521), Sixtus V (1585-1590), Urban VIII (1623-1644) and Benedict XIV (1740-1758). Finally, the most accurate process was promulgated by Benedict XV in the new *Code of Canon Law* (1917).¹³

1231. a) *Of the processes that take place before Beatification and Canonization*, one is diocesan, but several others are Roman. *The first* is a process of information, before diocesan tribunals, concerning the writings, the life and the morals of the servant of God.

13. CIC L.4 p.2, De causis Beatificationis et Canonizationis, cn.1999-2141; A. Michel, *Sainteté Note de l'Eglise*: DTC 14,854-60.

But the *Roman processes* are: a) *Introductory*, in which almost the same things are subjected to examination and debate which were considered in the diocesan process, and they are completed; b) *On Venerability*, concerning the public knowledge and heroism of the virtues of the servant of God, which must be proved in the face of objections: this process is submitted to the judgment of three *Congregations*—one which is called *before the preparatory*, the second *preparatory* and the third *general*, in which the Cardinals give a consultative vote; but the final decision is reserved to the Supreme Pontiff, who orders a decree to be promulgated on the heroism of the virtues, and from that point the servant of God can be called *Venerable*; c) *On miracles*, which must be examined and approved by medical experts, and this process, like the preceding one, must be submitted for the approbation of the three *Congregations*; d) *The process on "safely" (de "tuto") proceeding to the Beatification*, which is given this name because it is concluded with a decree that says: "one can proceed safely to the Beatification"; then a solemn *Beatification* follows this decree.

1232. b) *The process of Canonization* is threefold: e) *First*, concerning the salutary effects of the Beatification; f) *on new miracles*, which must be approved by the triple Congregation, as was said about the miracles before the Beatification; g) *The process on "safely" proceeding to the Canonization*, which is developed by three *Consistories*: by a *secret Consistory*, in which all and only the Cardinals are questioned and then they give their vote of Yes (*placet*); by a *public Consistory*, in which the diocese and the promoters of the cause through a spokesman recount the praises of the Blessed, and implore the Canonization, to which the Secretary responds by exhorting all to pray; by a *semi-public Consistory*, in which the Cardinals and the Bishops residing in Rome, after a mature study of the cause, hand over their vote to the Secretary; finally, at his good pleasure the Supreme Pontiff approves the vote and determines the day for the solemn Canonization.¹⁴

1233. *Given what was just said, now we make our argument*: From the processes of Beatification and Canonization, moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, appears manifestly proved, and it is also divinely confirmed by the performance of miracles. But in the Roman Catholic Church, after a rigid process of Canonization, many men and women have been beatified and canonized. Therefore from the processes of Beatification and Canonization it appears to be manifestly proved that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

1234. *The minor*. Before the 16th century, by a formal decree of the Pope 53 Saints were canonized, for example, the saints King Edward, Anselm, Bernard, Dominic, Francis, Anthony of Padua, King Louis, Thomas, Bonaventure, R. a Peñafort, Bridget, Catherine, Vincent Ferrer, and others. But since the 16th century, with the introduction of a more

14. See D'Herbigny, n.275.

rigid process of Canonization, several have been canonized: a) In fact 34 of them lived before the rise of Protestantism, for example, Saints Frances de Paula, Anthony, Laurence Justinian, Elizabeth of Portugal, the Seven Founders of the Order of Servites, Hyacinth, and others; b) there are many who lived after the rise of Protestantism, like St. Thomas of Villanova, St. John of God, St. Ignatius Loyola, St. Charles Borromeo, St. Francis Borgia, St. Vincent de Paul, St. Teresa, St. Aloysius, St. Francis de Sales, St. John of the Cross, St. Peter Claver, St. Joseph Calasanz, and many others. And so during four centuries, from the rise of Protestantism in 1517 until the year 1917, when the new CIC was promulgated, in the Catholic Church 113 Saints and 542 Blesseds were solemnly proclaimed.¹⁵

1235. *But after that*, according to the rigid form of the processes of Beatification and Canonization promulgated in the CIC, many solemn Beatifications and Canonizations have been celebrated, so that Pius XI alone proclaimed 496 Blesseds and 34 Saints, among whom are included St. Theresa of the Child Jesus, St. Peter Canisius, St. Sof. Barat, St. John Vianney, St. John Eudes, St. Robert Bellarmine, St. John Bosco, St. John Leonard, St. Gemma Gallgani, and others. Therefore from the processes of Beatification and Canonization it is abundantly clear that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, flourished in the Roman Catholic Church from the end of the 10th century until our own time.

1236. 3) *From the permanent Institutes of perfection* we prove that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, pertains to the Roman Catholic Church. The permanent Institutes we are speaking about are, a) *the state of the secular Clergy*, b) *the state of Religious*. From them we argue: The state of Clerics and of Religious by its own nature leads to moral holiness, both perfect and heroic. But both states de facto have always flourished in the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore from the permanent states of perfection it is certain that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

1237. *The major.* a) *The state of the secular Clergy* by its own nature leads to moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, because in general it implies, besides those things to which all the faithful are bound, the obligation of observing the things that are prescribed for Clerics in CIC l.2 p.1 [1917]; and in particular because it requires dedication to divine worship and the sacred ministries; in addition it demands the promise of obedience, which since at least the 5th century is promised formally in the rite of Ordination, and it demands besides chastity also celibacy, at least in the Western Church, in which gradually since the 4th century it was required and after St. Gregory the Great it was prescribed by the common law.¹⁶

15. Ottiger, 2,970-75; Michelitsch, § 188; D'Herbigny, n.276,2,B; Algermissen, 405-409.

16. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum* 2 n.86-128.

1238. *The major.* b) *The state of Religious* by its own nature leads to moral perfection, both perfect and heroic, so that by the Church it is acknowledge to be and is called in the proper sense *the state of acquiring perfection*.¹⁷ But the reason is, because in general it requires, besides those things to which all the faithful are held, observance of those things which CIC 1.2 p.2 prescribes for them; and in particular, because it involves the obligation of tending towards perfection by the observance of the evangelical counsels since the time of the *Ascetics* in the 2nd century; because it requires one to lead a life separated from the world and to abstain from many morally licit things since the time of the *Anchorites* of St. Anthony the Abbot at the end of the 3rd century; it requires a common way of living since the time of the *Cenobites* of St. Pachomius at the beginning of the 4th century; it required the observance of a stricter Rule and of the vows of stability and obedience from the time of the *Order* of St. Benedict in the 6th century; it requires the fulfillment of the three vows of poverty, chastity and obedience and dedication to the apostolate of souls since the time of the *mendicant Orders* of St. Francis and St. Dominic in the 13th century; finally, it requires a fuller dedication to the apostolate of all kinds since the time of the *Clerks Regular* of St. Ignatius in the 16th century and of many other Institutes which were established after that.¹⁸

1239. *The minor.* a) It is certain from the history of the Church that *the state of the secular Clergy* has always flourished in the Roman Catholic Church; for, it has always pertained to the office especially of secular Priests to ordain, direct and promote the moral, ascetical and religious life of the Roman Catholic Church. But it is clear that this status of the Clergy in our days is flourishing very well, especially as is seen from their number, which exceeds 260,000, and from the territories of jurisdiction committed to their care, which number about 2,000, that is, 1,514 Patriarchates, Archdioceses, Dioceses, and 486 Delegations, Administrations, Vicariates, Prefectures or Missions Apostolic.¹⁹

1240. *The minor.* b) That *the state of Religious men and women* has always flourished in the Roman Catholic Church is certain from the

17. Pius XII, *Allocutio "Annus sacer"*: AAS 43 (1951) 26-36.

18. See B. Llorca, *Manual de Hist. ecles.* (1942) n.76f.111-115.138.160f.188.210; J. Marx, *Hist. ecles.* § 47.70.84-86.103.129f.157; Z.G.-Villada, *Hist. ecles. De España* 2 p.1 c.14f.; Kirch, *Leitfaden KG* 1 § 98ff.

19. See D'Herbigny, n.207; C. Streit, *Atlas hierarchicus* (1929); L. Gramatica, *Testo e Atlante di Geografia ecclesiastica e missionaria* (1928); K. Guggenberger, *Klerus*: LTK 6 (1934) 41-44, who counts 257,000 secular Priests, 64,000 regular, with a total of 321,000, of whom there are 252,000 in Europe, 51,500 in America, 10,500 in Asia, 4,800 in Africa, 2,200 in Oceania; see Zapelena, th.13 p.467. The number of the territorial jurisdictions is given in the *Annuario Pontificio* for the year 1955, p. 1285.

History of them, which was published recently by Heimbucher; it is clear from their huge number of Saints, Blesseds, Venerables and Servants of God, both men and women; it is clear from the remarkable and permanent works of charity which they have always engaged in, but especially since the 6th century by the Order of St. Benedict, since the 12th century by the Cistercians and Premonstratensians, since the 13th century by the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians and Carmelites, since the 16th century by the Society of Jesus, and the very praiseworthy Institutes of charity founded by St. John of God and St. Vincent de Paul. After them innumerable other Institutes of men and women Religious have imitated their charity; but since the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the works of charity stand out especially which have for their founders St. John Bosco and St. Joseph Cottolengo. Added to this is the work of charity exceeding all others, namely, the evangelization of unbelievers, which since the 16th century has been carried out primarily by Religious. That the state of Religious in our time is flourishing very well is proved from the *Statistics of the Sacred Congregation of Religious*, 1942, where the Orders and Congregations of Pontifical right are listed—of men 156 with 220,041 members, and of women 732 with 586,646 members.²⁰

Therefore from the permanent Institutes of perfection it is certain that moral holiness, both perfect and heroic, pertains to the Roman Catholic Church.

1241. Third part: The four defined Notes do not pertain to the remaining Christian Confessions.

The four notes are lacking in the other Christian Confessions. Therefore they pertain to the Roman Catholic Church alone, and they accordingly distinguish her from the false ones as the true Church of Christ. The conclusion is certain from the two proved parts which precede this one. Now the assertion of the antecedent is to be proved.

1242. A. Either unity or catholicity are lacking in Protestants and Schismatics.

1) Regarding **Protestants**, if their sects are taken *together*, de facto they lack unity; if they are considered *individually*, they are lacking catholicity

20. M. Heimbucher, *Die Orden und Kongregationen der kathol. Kirche* 2 v. (1934); S. Congr. Dei Relig. *Statistica degli Ordini e delle Congregazioni religioſae de diritto pontificio* (1942); Sturm-Schulz-Fink, *Orden: LTK* 7 (1935) 748-61; Algermissen, 409-17; *Annuarium Pontificium* of the year 1942 lists 163 Orders and Congregations of Religious men, and 1071 Congregations of Religious women of Pontifical right; Id., of the year 1955 lists the Congregations of Pontifical Right: of men, 185, of women 1,376.

of fact. Therefore Protestants *de facto* are lacking either unity or catholicity.

1.⁰ *The sects of Protestants*, if they are taken all together, lack unity of fact, indeed according to their own principles they will never *de facto* be able to obtain it. Therefore for Protestants, if their sects are taken all together, *de facto* lack unity.

1243. *The antecedent. The Protestant sects, if they are taken all together:*

a) lack *unity of government*, because they are divided into more than 100 different main denominations and they are independent of each other; b) lack *unity of faith*, because now the articles of faith in which they agree cannot be established; this was made clear in the year 1925 in Stockholm, where 680 delegates from 13 sects from 37 nations convened under the theme of *Life and Action*, and they agreed to avoid the question about faith; the disagreement of Protestants concerning faith was very evident in their Congress, held in 1927 in Lausanne while gathering together under the theme of *Faith and Order*; there again they were not able to arrive at a harmonious agreement concerning the doctrine of the faith; and both tendencies do not seem to have obtained better fruits of union in the meetings held in 1937 of *Life and Action* in Oxford and *Faith and Order* in Edinburgh. However, they did establish the *World Council of Churches* in order to direct in the future the efforts of both tendencies. The first meeting of this *World Council* held in Amsterdam in 1948 and the second meeting held in Evanston in 1954 produced very little fruit, as we said in thesis 29, n.1127; c) by these attempts at *federation* rather than union, Protestants make obvious their lack of true union, which they seek, and in fact they admit their lack of true union, and they do not seem to be able to obtain it as long as they retain their principles on national religious independence, on personal freedom in the choice of doctrine, that is, as long as they deny that there ought to be in the Church a supreme power of teaching, ruling and sanctifying.²¹

1244. 2.⁰ *Protestant sects, if they are taken singly lack true catholicity.*

For, *de facto* the individual Protestant sects lack: a) *a large numerical diffusion*, because the more numerous are the *Calvinists* = 90,000,000, *Lutherans* = 70,000,000, *Anglicans* = 30,000,000; b) they also lack *a large geographic diffusion*, because either they are restricted to certain peoples, like the Lutherans to German peoples, and the Anglicans to the Anglo-

21. D'Herbigny, n.205f.; Zapelena, th.13 part.1 p.446-52; Algermissen, 770-76; Heiler, 14-19; I. Giordani, *Crisi protestante e unità della Chiesa* (1939); Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin*: DTC 14,1400. See above n.1127 and below n.1272.

Saxons, or within the same sect they are independent according to the various nations, which is something that can rightly be said about all the Protestant sects; c) finally, they lack *perpetuity* necessarily, because of the Protestant sects none of them are older than the 16th century.²²

1245. 2) Regarding **Schismatics**, if their sects are taken *together*, *de facto* lack unity, if they are taken *individually*, they lack *catholicity of fact*. Therefore Schismatics are lacking either unity or catholicity.

1.^o *Schismatic sects*, if they are taken *together*, *de facto* lack unity at least in government, and really according to their own principles they will never be able to obtain it. Therefore Schismatics, if their sects are taken together, *de facto* lack unity.

The antecedent. The sects of Schismatics, if they are taken together: a) *de facto* lack unity at least of government, because they are divided into about 20 truly independent sects, either *absolutely independent* which are called *Autocephalous*, or *relatively independent* which are called *Autonomous*²³; b) according to their principles they will never be able to obtain unity, because, given their principles of autocephalism and autonomy, they are not able to acknowledge *one supreme authority* which *de facto* would unite them under one government, and because a General Council, which could be for them a supreme authority, for the same reason, after Nicaea II in the year 787, according to them, has not been held; and as long as the separation from the Western Church lasts there cannot be such a Council, as they generally admit with Philaretus²⁴; c) *a fortiori* these points hold true for the contemporary Orientals favoring *Panchristianity* with Protestants, who, being content with only a vague concept of unity and preserving the independence of government of each sect, in doctrine and in worship, are trying to find only some kind of federation of all Christians. The saying of Tertullian can truly be applied to the Panchristians: "Schism is unity for them."²⁵

1246. 2.^o *The schismatic sects, if taken individually, lack catholicity of fact.* For, *de facto* the individual schismatic sects are lacking: a) *A large*

22. Zapelena, Appendix, 2 p.510-15; R.H. Benson, *Non-Catholic Denominations* (1910). See above n.1127 and below n.1272. See C. Crivelli, *Perque no diccionario de las sectas protestantes* (1948).

23. D'Herbigny, n.203f.; Zapelena, th.13 part.2 p.453-57; Jugie, 4,225-40; A. Fortescue, *Eastern Churches*: CE 5 (1909) 230-40; J. Lippl, *Griech. Kirche*: LTK 4 (1932) 697-703; Dumont, O.P., *Eglises orientales*: Tableau (1936); Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin, Unité*: DTC 14,1407-11.

24. Jugie, 4,305; Heiler, 215-220.225f.; Zankow, 88; Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin et Conc. Oecuménique*: DTC 14,1425-35. In 1948 they showed a certain unity that was non-jurisdictional but merely conventional; see V. Grumel, *loc.cit.*, note 43.

25. Heiler, 225-28; Zankow, 75-77; Tertullian, *De Praescr.* 42: ML 2,70. See n.1127.

numerical diffusion, because the more numerous ones are the Patriarchate of *Moscow* = 100,000,000, the Patriarchate of *Rumania* = 13,000,000, the Synodal Church of *Greece* = 7,000,000; b) *A large geographic diffusion*, because the individual sects have assumed an almost exclusive national character and therefore according to political disruptions, depending on the variations of nationalities, they are independent of one another, which became especially apparent after the great war which ended in 1918; c) Finally, they lack *perpetuity* necessarily, because the schismatic sects are not older than the 11th century or at most the 9th century.²⁶

1247. B. Protestants and Schismatics are lacking true apostolicity.

1) Among Protestants and Schismatics there cannot be a true apostolicity of formal succession.

1.^o *True apostolicity of formal succession* cannot be given except *within unity and catholicity*. But Protestants and Schismatics are lacking either unity or catholicity, as we have proved. Therefore among Protestants and Schismatics there cannot be given a true apostolicity of formal succession.

The major is certain, because Apostolicity of formal succession, that is, without any change of law, implies the right and obligation of union and communion with all the successors of the Apostles in the whole world (see John 17:11).

2.^o *True apostolicity of formal succession* cannot be given among those who do not retain the body of the Pastors of the Church constituted *in the same way as Christ constituted the College of Apostles*, that is, under one primatial authority of St. Peter and of his successors.²⁷ But Protestants and Schismatics do not retain the body of the Pastors constituted under the one primatial authority of St. Peter and his successors. Therefore true apostolicity of formal succession cannot be given among Protestants and Schismatics.

1248. The minor. a) *Concerning Protestants*, from history it is certain that they had their beginning in the 16th century by refusing obedience to the Apostolic Roman Church, which until then they had acknowledged to be endowed with the primatial authority of St. Peter; but their pertinacity in rebellion became very clear, because, having been invited and strongly encouraged, they refused to come to the Council of Trent, which had been convoked because of them.

26. Zapelena, Appendix 3 p. 516f.; Y. Congar, *Chrétiens desunis: Principes d'un Oecuménisme catholique* (1937); see Heiler, 153-178; J. Schweigl, *Die Hierarchien der getrennten Orthodoxie*: OrCh 13 (1928) 5-74; M. Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin, Les autocéphalies*: DTC 14, 1372-86.

27. For the teaching of St. Leo the Great and Innocent III, see above n.234-280: R 2191.

1249. *The minor.* b) *Concerning Schismatics*, also from history it is certain that they had their beginning in the 9th or 11th century through denial of subjection to the Apostolic Roman Church, whose primatial authority of St. Peter, until then always recognized by the Orientals, they denied, and indeed: α) they did this contrary to the explicit attestation which the Orientals manifested in the Councils of *Ephesus* (431), *Chalcedon* (451), *Constantinople III* (680); β) contrary to the solemn decision whereby they rejected the sedition of Photius in the Council of *Constantinople IV* (870); γ) contrary to the open retraction which after the time of Michael Cerularius the Orientals declared in the Councils of *Lyons II* (1274) and *Florence* (1439).²⁸

1250. 2) **The apostolicity of material succession** does not belong so fully and obviously to Protestants and Schismatics as it does to the Roman Catholic Church. Therefore the apostolicity of material succession *cannot be claimed by Protestants and Schismatics as a Note against the Roman Catholic Church.*

1.⁰ *Concerning Protestants*, a) they do not have a See founded by the Apostles in which, by a never interrupted series, Bishops *directly* succeed one another. Therefore apostolicity of material succession does not belong so fully and obviously to Protestants as it does to the Roman Catholic Church.

b) *Episcopalians* sects of Protestants can have material succession by reason of Orders of the Episcopate from the Apostles, but only *indirectly* and then as borrowed either from the Roman Catholic Church or from the Churches of Schismatics. Therefore they cannot ascribe it to themselves as their own.

1251. Whether de facto apostolicity of material succession by reason of the Orders should be conceded to the Episcopalian sects of Protestants depends on the questions about the value of the Ordinations by which they obtain the Episcopacy; for, the Ordinations of Anglicans were found to be invalid because of a defect of form at the time of Leo XIII (D 3315-3319).²⁹ Hence there can be a legitimate doubt concerning the visibility and easy recognition of the apostolicity of material succession of Protestants, and therefore it is certain that their apostolicity, if they have any, is not truly a *Note* which they can justly adduce in their favor.

c) *Non-Episcopalian sects of Protestants*, among whom especially are the *Luther-*

28. That the Orientals of the nine previous centuries had acknowledged the Primacy of the successors of St. Peter in the Roman Church is shown by non-Catholic authors like S.H. Scott, *The Eastern Churches and the Papacy* (1928) 350f.; Fr. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* (1937) 220-23; T.G. Jalland (1944). See n.453.

29. See D'Herbigny, n.329.

ans, Calvinists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists, since they lack the Episcopate, are devoid of all apostolicity of succession, even merely material by reason of their lack of Orders.

1252. 2.^o *To Schismatics* a) it belongs indeed to have some Sees, especially *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, which were founded by the Apostles; but b) it is not so certain that in them Bishops, *with a never interrupted series*, have succeeded *directly* from the Apostles down to our own time. Therefore, the apostolicity of material succession does not belong so fully and obviously to the Schismatics, as it does to the Roman Catholic Church.³⁰

1253. 3.^o We concede that the sects of *Schismatics and Protestants*, by reason of the *Order of the Episcopacy*, have material succession from the Apostles. However, this material succession in the power of Orders cannot be thought to be a *Note* sufficient to distinguish the true Church. For, since this power is handed on *by the sacrament of Orders*, it can be validly conferred, received and exercised by a capable subject, provided that the necessary matter, form and intention for validity are used; and so it can be validly *conferred, received and exercised* also by Heretics and Schismatics, although because of their heresy and schism they are not members of the Church. Therefore purely material succession in the power of Orders cannot be thought to be a *Note* sufficient to distinguish the true Church.³¹

1254. C. Protestants and Schismatics lack the Note of holiness.

1) To the Protestant sects: 1.^o *by right (de iure) all holiness is to be denied to them;* 2.^o *de facto they are lacking continuing perfect and heroic holiness;* 3.^o *the fruits of holiness cannot be attributed to them that are found among Protestants erring in good faith.* Therefore the Note of holiness is lacking in the Protestant sects.

The antecedent. 1.^o *By right all holiness is to be denied to Protestants.* For, works freely performed from a motive of charity are the foundation of all Christian Holiness. But Protestants have denied freedom in man and hold that faith alone justifies without works of charity. Therefore by right all Holiness is to be denied to Protestants.

The major is proved abundantly from Scripture: see Matt. 16:27; 25:34-46; Rom. 2:13; 1 Cor. 7:19; 13:1-13. *The minor* is evident from the teachings of Protestants, which the Catholic Church has condemned: In

30. See P.B. Gams, *Series Episcoporum Ecclesiae Catholicae* (1973); C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi* (1913). See the series of Bishops especially in the Sees of Antioch, Jerusalem, Alexandria and Constantinople.

31. Schismatics or heretics validly conferring or exercising the power or Orders, although separated from the true Church, act as her ministers, and also the true Church tacitly or openly concedes to them the jurisdiction, which is necessary for the good of the souls who are erring in good faith: see CIC cn.209 [1917]; Zapelena, p.457.

the *Bull "Exsurge Domine,"* of Leo X in 1520: D 1481-1485f.; also in the *Council of Trent*: D 1525, 1554-1557, 1559, 1561, 1563f. See also the freedom of man vindicated against Jansen by Innocent X: D 2003.³²

1255. *The antecedent.* 2.^o *De facto continuing perfect and heroic Holiness is lacking among Protestants.* For, continuing perfect and heroic Holiness is obtained by means of permanent Institutions, which are dedicated to the observance of the evangelical counsels. But de facto Protestants have rejected such Institutions, in fact they do not cease to ridicule them. Therefore de facto continuing perfect and heroic Holiness is lacking among Protestants.

The major is evident from what we said above about permanent Institutes, and its truth is apparent from the nature itself of the matter.

The minor is certain from history, because Protestants both theoretically and practically abolished the celibacy of priests and the Institutes of Religious in which men and women dedicate themselves to a life of perfection. Indeed, as a result of their principles on imputed justification and on the sufficiency of faith alone in order to obtain holiness, they ridicule and consider less useful the practice of mortification, virginity and self-abnegation, which is the foundation of the vows of poverty, chastity and obedience of Religious; they also ridicule the desire for humility and the cross of Christ, which is the foundation of the heroic life of Christians.³³

1256. 3.^o Therefore, *the fruits of holiness which are found among Protestants erring in good faith cannot be attributed to the Protestant sects.* For, the fruits of holiness, which we grant are found among Protestants erring in good faith, cannot be attributed to the Protestant sects, if they are really and de facto produced by the operation of other causes. Therefore, the fruits of holiness which are found among Protestants erring in good faith cannot be attributed to the Protestant sects.

The major is clear as the conclusion from what we have proved under 1.^o and 2.^o

1257. *The minor.* The causes really and de facto operating, which produce the fruits of holiness that we see among Protestants erring in good faith, are: 1.^a *The salvific will of God, who wants all men to be saved and to come to a knowledge of the truth* (1 Tim. 2:4), and so he distributes

32. Ottiger, 2,1026-30, 1034-37, 1041-44; Michelitsch, § 189; they cite the opinions of Luther, Calvin and Zwingli.

33. See Ottiger, 2,988-1024; A. Michel, *Sainteté dans les Protest.*: DTC 14,860-63.

his graces to men of good will even outside the true Church to those acting in good faith; 2.^a *The natural power of the revealed doctrine and of the example of Christ*, which are contained in the Holy Scriptures for the benefit of all those who are able to read it or hear about it; 3.^a *The efficacy of the Sacraments* of Baptism, Holy Orders and the Eucharist, which, although they are Sacraments of the true Church, nevertheless they can be validly administered and received by suitable persons even though they are living outside the true Church, provided that the matter, form and intention necessary for validity are used; 4.^a *The moral influence* and salutary examples of the Roman Catholic Church, which especially the so-called *High Anglican, Lutheran and American Church* since the middle of the 19th century has imitated in liturgical worship, in Institutions similar to the state of Religious,³⁴ in works of charity, in the practice of spiritual Exercises, in the use of confession, and in other things. In fact the *Anglican Church*, in imitation of the Catholic Church, celebrated a simulated *Canonization of Saints* in the year 1924, in which it raised eleven men to heavenly honors, namely, Tertullian, Catherine of Siena, John Wycliffe, Wesley, Parker, Cranmer, Keble, Nightingale, Land, Charles I and Henry VI, all English with the exception of Tertullian and Catherine. Therefore all of these cannot be said to be the proper fruits of the Protestant sects, but they are produced by other causes operating really and de facto.³⁵

1258. *The case of the Indian, Sadhu-Sundar-Singh*, converted to Christianity in the Anglican Church, if it is true in some of the circumstances, could be a good example to show the bountifulness of the salvific will of God towards naturally good souls, who seek God in good faith; but in no way can this case be adduced as confirmation of the Anglican error, nor does it in any way commend the Anglican Church in preference to the Roman Catholic Church.³⁶

1259. 2) The Note of holiness is lacking in the sects of Schismatics.³⁷

1.0 If *Schismatics* are compared with Protestants:

a) They use *more means of holiness*. *The means of holiness, which the Schismatics retain, are:* α) *doctrinal and moral*, which are, the entire Holy Scriptures, the ancient Creed of faith, the decrees of the first seven

34. A. Urretia, *Familiae religiosae apud Anglicanos*: CommentRelig 27 (1948) 90,204; 28 (1949) 67-83.

35. D'Herbigny, n.227,5.338; Bainvel, 628; Algermissen, 639-44, 675-77; A. D'Ales, *Saints*: DAFC 4,1136. See L. Marchal, *Puseysme*: DTC 13,1367-1425.

36. L. de Grandmaison, *Le Sadhu Sundar Singh*: RechScRel 12 (1922) 1-19; V.O. Pfister, *Die Legende Sundar Singhs* (1926).

37. Jugie, 4,544-65; Ottiger, 2,1053-58; D'Herbigny, n.330; see Heiler, 548-50; Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin, Moyens de sanctification*: DTC 14,1454-63.

Ecumenical Councils, the works of the ancient holy fathers; β) *the liturgies*, which are, various offices of sacred worship in honor of God, of the Bl. Virgin Mary and of many Saints; γ) *the seven Sacraments of the N.T.*, which they properly administer to the faithful. But these means of holiness are more numerous, as is obvious, than those retained by Protestants.

1260. b) They obtain more abundant fruits of holiness. The fruits of *holiness*, which the Schismatics manifest, are: α) those which flow from *the means used*: from the profession of the right doctrine of faith and morals, from the praxis of prayer and a suitable liturgical worship, from the use of all the Sacraments; β) *the status of Priests and Monks*, that is, of men who have devoted themselves especially to divine worship and the ascetical life; γ) *Martyrs, or Saints* declared as such by a public decree by the Churches of the Schismatics since the 12th century. But these fruits of holiness must be said to be greater than those which the Protestants have produced. Therefore, in comparison with Protestants, Schismatics can indeed proclaim their own holiness.

1261. 2.^o If *Schismatics* are compared with Catholics, their *holiness is far inferior to the holiness of Catholics*, both by reason of the means used and by reason of the fruits attained.

a) *By reason of the means* of holiness: for, the Roman Catholic Church, besides all those means which we grant that the Schismatics have, has in addition: α) *a universal authority*, independent of the power of the State, which effectively protects the freedom of the Church and prescribes disciplinary norms adapted to the various necessities of the times; β) *the infallible Magisterium* to guard and declare the doctrine of faith and morals, and continually to protect it from the errors that appear again and again; γ) *the integrity of all the Sacraments* without the lax permission of divorce, granted by Schismatics, which has inflicted a serious wound on the holiness of Christian morals.

1262. b) *By reason of the fruits* of holiness, the Roman Catholic Church by far surpasses Schismatics: α) because of a *more perfect and fuller grade* in the profession of the doctrine of faith and morals, in the praxis of prayer and of liturgical worship, in the use of all the Sacraments; β) because of by far *the greater number and the more perfect formation* and life of the state or Priests and Religious, which we spoke about above; γ) because of the *huge number of martyrs and the manifest heroism of the virtues of many Saints*, confirmed especially since the 12th century by the rigid processes

of Canonization and Beatification.³⁸

Hence it is clear that the holiness of Schismatics, when compared with the holiness of Catholics, in every way is far inferior. Therefore also by that fact it is clear that Schismatics cannot adduce their holiness against Catholics as a Note to distinguish the true Church. Yet we add further:

1263. c). *The holiness of Schismatics* cannot be said to be proper to the schismatic sects as such, but rather of that Church from which these sects have separated themselves. For, the principal means of holiness and the fruits of holiness of the Schismatics have been taken from the Church which before the 9th century was in communion with Apostolic See of St. Peter and was obedient to the successor of St. Peter in the Primacy. Therefore, they should rather be said to belong to that Church from which these sects separated themselves. And this seems to be confirmed, because after the separation, these means of holiness among the Schismatics appear as *measured by inactivity, exhausted in vigor, lacking life, tending to degeneration*, while on the contrary the same means in the Roman Catholic Church enjoy *agility, vigor and life*, whereby they are always wonderfully adapted to the new spiritual necessities of the faithful.³⁹ Hence it is licit to conclude that among the Schismatics they are like branches cut off from the trunk from which the true force and vitality for them is derived.

1264. Scholium. *An argumentation suited to the mind of Schismatics.* From principles, which are admitted both by Catholics and Schismatics, it can be demonstrated for Schismatics, and in fact more effectively, according to Jugie, than from the Notes, that their Church is not the true Church of Christ.⁴⁰

1) *The true Church of Christ enjoys the perpetual gift of infallibility* in teaching her doctrine (Matt. 28:18-20; John 14:26). But the Church of the Schismatics lost this infallibility, because since the 12th century it has not been able to resolve any controversy infallibly nor to assemble the organ of infallibility, an *Ecumenical Council*. Therefore.

38. Benedict XIV, *De Servorum Dei beatificatione et Beatorum canonizatione* l.1 c.46 n.4; Jugie, 4,550-559; D'Herbigny, n.276.

39. M. Jugie, 4,544-47; see Heiler, 378f.388.561-65.

40. M. Jugies, 4,591-97. Jugie develops this argument more at length in his work, *Où se trouve le Christianisme intégral?* (1947). However, we cannot admit the opinion of M. Jugie who holds, p.246, that the traditional method of proving the true Church from the Notes, "should be replaced by the comparative method, whereby it is asserted only that the Roman Catholic Church is *more One, more Holy, more Catholic, and more Apostolic* than any of the other Christian confessions." For, if he concedes that the dissident Church truly have the essential properties with which singled out his own Church, he cannot deny that the same are truly Churches of Christ. But if in the Roman Catholic Church these properties are present on a more perfect level, from that it can be concluded only that the Roman Catholic Church differs in *grade* only from the dissident Churches, and so they can say at most that she is the first along those that equally can be called Churches of Christ; I think that the promoters of Panchristianity can easily endorse this conclusion. See T. Zapelena, th.13 schol.5.

2) *The true Church of Christ cannot teach anything contrary to the teaching of Christ* (Matt. 28:18-20). But the Church of the Schismatics teaches theoretically and especially practically that a marriage can be dissolved for several reasons (more than 20). Therefore.

3) *The true Church of Christ cannot fail to fulfill the duty of preaching the Gospel* to all nations (Matt. 28:19; Acts 1:8). But the Church of the Schismatics since the 12th century has failed to fulfill this duty. Therefore.

1265. 4) *The true Church of Christ*, since it is infallible and indefectible, *cannot be deficient either in the truth of faith or in its divine social constitution*. But the Church of the Schismatics since the 12th century has been deficient in the truth of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father through the Son or from the Father and the Son, since it teaches that He proceeds from the Father alone; it has also been deficient in the divine social constitution of the Church, since it refuses to recognize the supreme authority of St. Peter and his successors. Therefore.

5) *The true Church of Christ must be one*, with the social unity of communion in charity (John 13:25; 17:21). But the Church of the Schismatics lacks this social unity, since theoretically and practically it holds the principle of the independence of the individual autocephalous and autonomous Churches. Therefore.

6) *The true Church of Christ*, as a perfect society, *in pursuing its end must be independent of the control of the State*. But the Churches of the Schismatics often theoretically and especially in practice are under the control of the States. Therefore.

7) *The true Church of Christ must continually produce abundant fruits of holiness* (John 14:12-14; 15:5.7.16; Matt. 7:17-20). But among the Schismatics since the 12th century few fruits of holiness have been produced. Therefore.

1266. *The main reason for these defects*, under which the Churches of the Schismatics labor, as Heiler himself, who is their great admirer, admits, must rightly be placed in their separation from the Primacy of St. Peter and his successors, to whom Christ entrusted the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, whom He established as the foundation and supreme judge in the Church, to whom he committed the task of confirming the brothers and of feeding his flock (Matt. 16:18f.; Luke 22:31f.; John 21:15-17). And therefore they lack *the true and visible principle* of unity, of infallibility, of fecundity, of vigor, of independence, of freedom and of life, which Christ divinely established.⁴¹

1267. Objections.⁴² A. *Against the argument of the Notes in general.*

1) Catholic authors do not agree among themselves either in the notion of the Notes or in the definition of the individual Notes or in their number. Therefore the proof from the Notes should be said to be at least obscure and ineffectual: G. Thils, 290-293.

I distinguish the antecedent. Those who have not sufficiently penetrated the nature

41. See F. Heiler, *Urkirche und Ostkirche* 561-565.

42. G. Thils, *Les Notes de l'Eglise* (1937); M. Jugie, *Où se trouve le Christianisme integral?* (1947); Zapelena, 1.468-470; Muncunill, n.239.243.249.258.264.272; D'Herbigny, n.225.266.279.331.341; Dorsch, 622.634.643.645.652.669-678; Lercher, n.454.

of the argument from the Notes, *conceded*; those who have well perceived the nature of this argument, *I subdistinguish*: they disagree on further inquiries and in subtleties, which are never lacking in human knowledge, and especially in matters that depend on a certain moral estimation, *conceded*; they disagree of the essentials on which depends the efficacy of the argument from the Notes, *denied*.

1268. 2. The argument from the Notes is based on this syllogism: Christ designated his Church with some distinctive properties; and properties of this kind are found only in the Catholic Church; therefore the Catholic Church is the true Church of Christ. But in this syllogism neither the major nor the minor are proved perfectly. Therefore the argument from the Notes proves nothing: Thils, 328.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. The major and minor of the syllogism are not proved with a perfect metaphysical or mathematical proof, *conceded*; with a proof responding to the nature of the matter in question, that is, with a proof generating moral certitude, *denied*. In the same way I distinguish the *consequent* and *I deny the consequence*.

1269. 3. The more effective argument, which is proposed, is derived from the Notes taken together. But from the Notes taken together the proof is based on the nature of a moral miracle, which the four properties of the Creed have when they are taken together. Therefore from the Notes themselves there is no efficacious proof.

I concede the major and distinguish the minor. The proof can be based on the nature of a moral miracle, which pertains to the Notes alone, as they are verified in the Catholic Church, *denied*; also, *I subdistinguish*: and then it is a proof by the empirical way, *conceded*; it is a proof by way of the Notes, *denied*.

1270. 4. The way of the Notes was devised to convince Protestants who accept the divine authority of Christ and of Scripture. But contemporary Protestants do not accept this authority. Therefore the way of the Notes today is useless.

I distinguish the major. Believing Protestants were the occasion leading to the development of the way of the Notes, *conceded*; the way of the Notes by its own nature is able to convince believing Protestants, *I subdistinguish*: also, *conceded*; only, *denied*; for, it can also convince believing Schismatics and it can confirm and instruct Catholics in their own faith. *I also distinguish the minor.* Many contemporary Protestants, imbued with Rationalism or Modernism, do not acknowledge the divine authority of Christ and of Scripture, *conceded*; many others who have remained immune to Rationalism and Modernism, *denied*. Although the way of the Notes today is less useful related to those who have been infected with Rationalism and Modernism, nevertheless it is very useful with relation to very many believing Protestants and Schismatics who are living today.

1271. 5. The four properties of the Creed, although on a lower level but certainly to some degree, are found also in the Oriental Orthodox Church and in the principal sects of Protestants, especially the Episcopalian. Therefore in the argument from the Notes

the minor is false, which says that these four properties are found *only* in the Catholic Church: Thils, 339; Jugie, 246.

I distinguish the antecedent. And because they are found on a lower level in these Churches, it is clear that they cannot designate these Churches as true against the Catholic Church, *conceded*; and because in some way they are found in these Churches, it must be granted that they participate in the properties of the true Church, *I subdistinguish*: they participate in the four properties of the Church in the essential measure that Christ willed, *denied*; they participate in the same properties in a measure fully insufficient, *I subdistinguish again*: and this participation is to be attributed rather to the universal salvific will of God, and the exercise of the power of Orders, which produces its effects by the performance of the rite itself (*ex opere operato*) even if the minister and the recipient are not members of the true Church, and with the at least implicit delegation and supplying of the one who has the true power of jurisdiction of the Church, *conceded*; and this participation is to be attributed to the same Churches in such a way that they can say it is proper to themselves and not rather borrowed, as we have said, from the true Church, *denied*.

1272. 6. At least the unity and to some extent also the catholicity of Churches separated from the Catholic Church were clearly demonstrated in the meetings, which were held in 1948 *by the Oriental Orthodox in Moscow, by the Anglicans in Lambeth and by the Panchristians in Amsterdam*. Therefore at least two of the principle Notes cannot be denied to them.

I distinguish the antecedent. In the cited meetings it was clear that the dissident Churches were eagerly seeking at least some kind of apparent unity and catholicity, which accordingly they acknowledge that they are lacking, *conceded*: it was clear that they obtained some type of true unity and catholicity, *I subdistinguish*: conventional, occasional and transient, *I bypass that*; real unity and catholicity, permanent and founded on one faith and one government, *denied*. You will find the reason for these distinctions in the genuine and reliable *Acts* of these three meetings, in which *a unity of government* between these competing Churches *is expressly excluded*, and *a merely consultative force* is given to the decisions of the large meetings themselves, but *no obligatory or authoritative force*.⁴³

1273. B. Against the individual Notes. 7. Against the unity of the Church they are wont to raise these objections: a) the disagreement between St. Cyprian and Pope St. Stephen about the question of re-baptizing heretics; b) the opposition of the Western Bishops to the condemnation of the so-called *Three Chapters* defined by the *Second Council of Constantinople*; c) the *Acacian schism* lasting from 484 to 519.

43. See *The Lambeth Conference* (1948); *The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports*: A. Jansen, *La VIII^e Conférence de Lambeth*; V. Grumel, *Le I^{er} Centenaire de l'Autocéphalie de l'Eglise russe et la Conférence des Eglises Orthodoxes Autocéphales*; A. Jansen, *La première Assemblée du "Conseil Oecuménique des Eglises"*: These three informations are in Document. Cathol. 46 (1949) 287-312, 365-378, 541-567, 665-700, 735-746. On the meetings in Amsterdam (1948), Lund (1952) and Evanston (1954) see what we said in n.1127.

In these and in similar cases, that could be cited, either it did not develop to obstinacy in error or in schism, as in cases a) and b), or if obstinacy was present, unity was preserved because the heretics or schismatics were separated from the body of the Church, as in the case under c).⁴⁴

1274. 8. At least at the time of the so-called *Western Schism*, from the year 1378 to 1417, the unity of the Catholic Church was divided into several factions. Therefore if at one time it was not one, it never was the true Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. It was divided into several factions, all of which were legitimate, *denied*; of which one, namely the Roman, was legitimate, but the other schismatic, *I subdistinguish*: with formal schism, *denied*; with purely material schism, *again I subdistinguish*: with a real and proper schism, or with an obstinate will of not obeying the true Supreme Pontiff, *denied*; with a schism in the improper sense, or with an undecided and conditioned will of not obeying a doubtful Pontiff, *again I subdistinguish*: and with such apparent schism the visibility of the unity of the Church was obscured, *conceded*; the visibility itself was removed, *denied*. There is an explanation of these distinctions below in the scholium, n.1278-1283.

1275. 9. At the time of the Council of Ariminensis catholicity was lacking. For, after the Bishops convened by the Arians signed the proposed formula, St. Jerome did not hesitate to say: "Then the name of *Usia* was abolished; then the condemnation of the *Nicene Faith* was demanded. The whole world groaned and it was amazed that it was Arian."⁴⁵

According to the context of the cited passage, *I distinguish the antecedent*: St. Jerome wants to say: All the Bishops grieved and were amazed that they were thought to be Arian because in good faith they signed a formula which they had understood in a fully orthodox sense, *conceded*; St. Jerome wants to signify that the whole Church groaned and was amazed because their Bishops really had embraced the Arian heresy, *denied*. For, a little further on in the same place the holy Doctor himself adds: "The Bishops came together who, having been tricked by the Ariminensian deceits, proceeded without a heretical intention, bearing witness to the Body of the Lord and whatever is holy in the Church, being aware of nothing evil in their faith. We thought, they said, that the meaning agreed with the words; nor did we think that in the Church of God, where there is simplicity, where there is pure confession, that one thing could be hidden in the heart, while something else is spoken with the lips. A good estimation about evil persons deceived us. We priests of Christ had no thought of fighting against Christ."

44. See B. Llorca, *Historia Eclesiástica* 120.172.200.

45. St. Jerome, *Dialogus contra Luciferianos* n.19: ML 23,172.

1276. Excursus. On the Church inasmuch as by itself it is a great motive of credibility.

After having proved the truth of the Roman Catholic Church from her four *Notes*, now we intend to establish a proof, *from the true nature of a miracle* which the same four properties have, as they are verified de facto in the Roman Catholic Church.¹

As it seems to us, the right place for this proof is in the treatise *On the Church*, and so rightly in this treatise a proof of this kind is developed by the authors, like Dieckmann, n.599-631; D'Herbigny, th.29; De Guibert, th.3. Also *Vatican Council I* defined that the true *Church* is recognizable in this way, namely, because by herself alone de facto she is a moral miracle, which undeniably demonstrates the truth of the testimony about herself.

Vatican Council I shows the norm and nature of this type of argumentation:

"In fact, it is to the Catholic Church alone that belong all those signs that are so numerous and so wonderfully arranged by God to make evident the credibility of the Christian faith. In fact, the Church by herself, with her marvelous propagation, eminent holiness, and inexhaustible fruitfulness in everything that is good, with her catholic unity and invincible stability, is a great and perpetual motive of credibility and an irrefutable testimony of her divine mission": D 3013.

1277. *The reason for this moral miracle* can easily be discovered in the *unity, catholicity, apostolicity and holiness* as they are verified, *concretely and as a result of experience*, in the Roman Catholic Church. For, 1) they exist in the Catholic Church *with such eminent perfection, with such constant stability, with such extensive amplitude*, that by far they can never be found *on such a level* in any other human society. Therefore, for that very reason they must be recognized as *absolutely unusual effects*. Another reason is 2) that the same qualities are obtained, preserved and diffused *by means, according to human ability*, that are really *very feeble*.² Therefore, for that reason they must be attributed to a heavenly cause. Add also 3) *the huge difficulties* that are constantly opposed to the obtaining, preserving and increasing of these qualities in such a grade of perfection: I mean difficulties a) *coming from within*, namely, because they are to be obtained, preserved and increased *by means of weak and fragile human beings*, who tend in the opposite direction because of the strength and heat of the passions³; I mean difficulties 3) *coming from without, from many persecutions or impediments fighting against the Church*, which often proceed from prejudices or desires especially of a religious, or

1. For the history of this proof, see what we wrote in the Introduction, n.7-9; see Dieckmann, n.607-610. Regarding adversaries, see S. Tromp, *De Revelatione christiana* (1945) 113-117. Also see J. Balmes, *El Protest. compar. con el Catol.* c.3

2. S.Th. I CG 6; see St. Cyprian, *De catholicae Ecclesiae unitate* 5: R 556.

3. S.Th. I CG 6.

social, or political, or historical nature.⁴ Hence it is immediately apparent that, *only from a cause surpassing human powers* and overcoming these huge difficulties, such an eminent grade of the qualities of perfection could be had.⁵

Indeed, the Roman Catholic Church says that she is the only true Church instituted by Christ, and in confirmation of this assertion she appeals to the moral miracle which is implied in her existence. Therefore she really is what she says she is. We wish to refer to this argument only briefly, while refraining from its full exposition, because in the preceding treatise *On Christian Revelation* it has already been explained sufficiently.⁶

1278. Scholium. On the Western Schism (1378-1417).⁷

The history of this unfortunate so-called Schism in our time is now fully clear. According to it, the Catholic Church seems to have been divided from the year 1378 to 1409, *into two factions, namely the Roman and the Avignon*, to which, from the year 1409, was added a *third faction, namely, of Pisa*. Therefore, for 38 years the unity of government in the Catholic Church seems to have been lacking.

In the light of History it can be conceded that this disastrous period of 38 years surely was a brief and sad evident period of confusion in the unity of the Catholic Church.⁸

1279. In order to solve the difficulty arising from this situation, *three main solutions* are proposed by Theologians: 1) There were several factions in the Church, *I distinguish*. One of which was legitimate, namely, the Roman, but the others were schismatic, and therefore separated from the unity of the Church, *conceded*; all of which are legitimate and persevering in the unity of the Church, *denied*. Thus more or less Straub.⁹

2) There were in the Church several factions. *I distinguish*. All legitimate, *denied*; one of which, namely the Roman, was legitimate, but the others were schismatic, *I subdistinguish*: materially, *conceded*; formally, *denied*. Thus De Groot and De San.¹⁰

4. St. Augustine, *De fide rerum quae non videntur* c.6 n.7: ML 40,176; M.J. Congar, *Schisme*: DTC 14,1288-1299. For a brief history of the various schisms, see J. Mark, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* § 28.36.40.65.74.76.96.160.

5. St. John Chrysostom, *Homilia de capto Eutropio* 1 (a.399): MG 52,397.

6. St. Augustine, *Sermo de Symbolo* c.6 n.14: ML 40,635; R 1535.

7. *Schisma Occidentis* (1378-1417): you will find it explained well historically in L. Salambier, *Le grand schisme d'Occident* (1921); more briefly by the same author, *Schisme d'Occident*: DAFC 4,1228-1241; E. Krebs, *Abendländischen Schisma*: LTK 9,259-261; L. von Pastor, *Historia de los Papas* 1 l.1 c.2; Cristiani, in G. Jacquemet, *Tue es Petrus, Encyclopedie sur le Papauté* (1934) 429; E. van. Steenberghe, *Schisme d'Occident*: DTC 14,1468-1492.

8. See Zapelena, *De Ecclesia* 1,468; Cotter, *Theol Fundam.* 479.

9. A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* n.1477-1485.

10. De Groot, *Summa Apologet. de Ecclesia* 212; De San, *De Ecclesia* n.374 at 2.

1280. 3) There were in the Church several factions. *I distinguish.* All legitimate, *denied*; one of which, namely the Roman, was legitimate, but the others schismatic, *I subdistinguish:* with formal schism, *denied*; with purely material schism, *again I subdistinguish:* with real and proper schism, that is, with a firm and absolute will of not obeying the true Pontiff, *denied*; with apparent schism and in the improper sense, that is, with an undecided and conditioned will of not obeying a doubtful Pontiff or one about whom it is not certain that he is the true Pontiff, *again I subdistinguish:* with such a schism whereby the visibility of unity *was obscured, conceded*; whereby the visibility itself of unity *was destroyed, denied*. Thus more or less Dorsch.¹¹ The same position is found more developed by D'Herbigny.¹²

All these solution presuppose as already proven historically that the legitimate one, of the two or three contenders, is the one who succeeded and lived in Rome, as is certain from the works which we just cited in note 7.

1281. *The so-called Western Schism* cannot be said to be a *formal and proper* schism, because, according to the ancient notion of schism which St. Thomas has transmitted to us in his *Summa*, more than a hundred years before the beginning of the so-called Western Schism; he says that in the proper sense "schismatics are those who refuse to submit to the Sovereign Pontiff, and to hold communion with those members of the Church who acknowledge his supremacy."¹³ Now at that time *no one refused to submit to the Sovereign Pontiff*, and in fact everyone was trying to find out who really was the legitimate Sovereign Pontiff, so that they could be obedient to him. Therefore there was not *a voluntary separation from unity*, but merely a *disagreement concerning a question of fact*, namely, whether this man or that man was the true Sovereign Pontiff. This controversy surely obscured the visibility of unity, but it by no means destroyed it, because it openly revealed the *desire for unity* common to all. It was like the situation in a Kingdom, during a struggle and civil war among factions disputing about the legitimate successor, when no one says that the Kingdom itself is divided or that the visibility of unity has disappeared; rather, the situation is that the various factions of one and the same Kingdom are fighting over the legitimacy of the person who should legally be ruling over them.

1282. Rightly, therefore, the well-known Protestant historian, Ferdinand Gregorovius, concluded: "A temporal Kingdom caught up in such difficulties would certainly perish; but the organization of the ecclesiastical Kingdom was so wonderfully perfect and the idea of the Primacy so indestructible, that this Schism, surely the most serious of all, did nothing else but demonstrate the indivisibility of the Church."¹⁴

1283. Actually, however, *unity in faith and worship* was evident. The unity of government was also present, because the legitimate Pontiff exercised the power of govern-

11. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* 669-674.

12. D'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.279.

13. S.Th. II-II, q. 39, a. 1;

14. F. Gregorovius, *Geschichte der Stadt Rom in Mittelalter* I.12 c.6 § 2.

ment: 1) *by himself*, as is clear, in the part of the faithful that was obedient to him; 2) *through his own delegates*, in other parts of the faithful, which, given the common error then or the positive and probable doubt, obeyed others whom they thought to be legitimate. For, from the earliest antiquity this principle has been observed in the Church: In a common error or in a positive or probable doubt, the Church supplies jurisdiction (CIC 209 [1917]).¹⁵ Therefore the true Sovereign Pontiff in those circumstances, by supplying jurisdiction, exercised his own proper power of government also through Pontiffs, Bishops and Priests of the other factions, as through his own delegates.

15. See L. Rodrigo, *Praelectiones Theologico-morales* n.64-70; Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum* t.2 n.378-382.

CHAPTER IV

Recapitulation of the treatise on the Church

ONE ARTICLE

THE THREEFOLD POWER IS THE PRIMARY LAW OF THE CHURCH

Thesis 32. Christ the Lord established the threefold power, which he imparted to the Apostles and their successors, namely, of teaching, ruling and sanctifying men, as the primary law of the whole Church (Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis"*: AAS 35 [1943] 209).

1284. S.Th. II-II, q. 39, a. 3; *Comment in Mt 28:18*; F. Suarez, *Def. Fidei* l.3 c.6 n.1,15; l.6 c.7 n.4,14; M.J. Scheeben, *Handbuch der kathol. Dogmatik* (1874-1903) 1 § 10; 3 § 268-273; 4 § 329 n.58; I.B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia* th.5; see th.17 and 19; L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* q.8; H. Dieckmann, *De Ecclesia* n.900-918; D. Palmieri, *De Rom. Pontifice, Prolegom. de Ecclesia* § 45; A. Straub, *De Ecclesia* th.20; Ae. Dorsch, *De Ecclesia* ass.12; M. d'Herbigny, *De Ecclesia* n.125; L. Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Instit. Theol.* 1 th.46; A. Michelitsch, *Theol. Fundam.* § 208; R. Schultes, *De Ecclesia* a.39; De Guibert, *De Ecclesia* n.216; H. Felder, *Demonst. Cathol.* 199; A. Stolz, *De Ecclesia* 36; J. Anger, *La doctrine du Corps Mystique* (1946) part.1 c.2 p.65-77; part.3 c.1 p.248-256; E. Mura, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* t.2,21-120, 336-410; C. Algermissen, *La Chiesa e le Chiese* part.1 c.5-8 p.22-41; Ch. Journet, *L'Eglise du Verbe Incarné* (1941) 180-184; Jo. Fuchs, *Magisterium, Ministerium, Regimen* (1941); E. Mersch, *La Théologie du Corps Mystique* (1946) t.2 c.18f. p.241-332; G. Phillips, *Compend. Iur. Eccles.* § 8,48; F.X. Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum* t.2 n.48; L. Rod. Sotillo, *Compend. Iur. Publ. Eccles.* (19470 n.124-126; J. Salaverri, *La triple potestad de la Iglesia*: MiscCom 14 (1950) 5-84; T. Zapelena, 2 (1954) th.16 schol.

1285. Connection. This thesis is a *recapitulation* of the treatise on the Church. For, presupposing as proved in the treatise on Christ the divine Legate, that the messianic power, which Jesus as man received from the Father, is comprehended in a *threefold office*, that is, of *Teacher, King and Priest*, already in the treatise on the Church we have proved: First, that Christ the Lord handed over this same messianic power to the Church when *he conferred on her the threefold office*, namely, of *teaching, ruling and sanctifying men*. But then we explained the same matter more accurately in three individual books: and so in Book I we saw that *Christ*, sent by the Father as King, *instituted his Church as a Kingdom*, and that he conferred on her in perpetuity his hierarchical and monarchic power of ruling; in Book II we showed that *Christ*, endowed with the office of Teacher by the Father, *handed over to the Church his authentic and infallible office of teaching*; finally, in Book III we proved that *Christ*, constituted a Priest by the Father, *made his Church the partaker and heir of his eternal priesthood for the*

sanctification and salvation of men. Now we are going to recapitulate the whole treatise in this thesis, which with a willing and grateful heart we are borrowing from the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis"* of Pope Pius XII.

1286. Definition of terms. We understand the *primary law* of the Church as that which first of all and per se Christ established as the norm according to which the whole constitution of the Church would be ordered. Therefore this primary law is fundamental and constitutive of the whole Church.

1287. *The power of the Church* is usually considered in two ways: 1) *In itself*, that is, according to its intrinsic and formal reasons; 2) *In the subject* who exercises it, that is, according to the way in which it is conferred on a subject.¹

1288. 1) Considered in itself, *the threefold power of the Church* is distinguished from its threefold *act, object and end*: a) It is proper to the *power of teaching to teach authentically*, that is, to propose *revealed truth* or truth connected with revealed truths, so that *with the assent of the intellect* men are bound to embrace it and rightly hold the Christian faith. b) It is proper to the *power of ruling to rule*, that is, to enact *laws or precepts* leading to the end of the Church, so that *with obedience of the will* the faithful will observe them and perform their actions according to the law of Christ. c) It is proper to the *power of sanctifying to sanctify*, that is, to administer *the means* instituted to confer *holiness*, so that with a suitable disposition of mind the *faithful will accept them* and obtain supernatural holiness.

1289. Under this respect St. Thomas also distinguishes the threefold power of the Church:

"Go therefore and teach all nations. He imposes an office and it is a threefold office. First of all, of teaching; secondly, of baptizing; thirdly of fulfilling the office with regard to morals... And he says: Go therefore and teach, because this is the first matter in which we must be instructed, namely in faith... And from this it developed in the Church that first of all he catechizes those to be baptized, that is, he instructs them in the faith. And after they have learned the faith, he gives the office of baptizing: Baptizing them etc., as if he were to say: When someone is promoted to this dignity, it is necessary first that the dignity be made know to him. But is it sufficient for salvation to believe and to be

1. I. Anger, *La doctrine du Corps Mystique de Jésus-Christ* (1946) part 3 c.1 a.1 p.254f.

baptized? No; instruction in morals is also required; therefore he says: Teach them to observe all that I have commanded you."²

This *tripartite* distinction of ecclesiastical power is made *according to the intrinsic, formal and specific reasons of the power itself*, as is clear from the threefold given notion, which we derived from the threefold *act, object and end* of the power.

1290. 2) However, the same power of the Church, if we look at the *extrinsic reasons*, which it assumes *from the way in which it is conferred on the subject*, we see that it is given to the subject *in two ways*: namely, partly *from the sacred Ordination*, but partly *from the authoritative mission*.³ Hence the same *intrinsically and formally threefold power, extrinsically or according to the twofold way* by which it is conferred on a subject, rightly is also distinguished *in two ways*: a) *The power of Orders* is that which is conferred on a subject *by sacred Ordination*, whereby from the rite itself (*ex opere operato*) the character is impressed, and therefore it is called sacramental. b) *The power of jurisdiction* is that which is conferred on the subject *by an authoritative mission*, by which the right to exercise it is given and hence it was wont to be defined as *Jurisdiction in a broader sense*.⁴ For this reason St. Thomas also divided it:

"Spiritual power is twofold, the one sacramental, the other a power of jurisdiction. The *sacramental* power is one that is conferred by some kind of consecration... On the other hand, the power of *jurisdiction* is that which is conferred by a mere human appointment."⁵

Therefore this bipartite division of ecclesiastical power takes place according to the way in which the power is given to the subject, as is certain from the words themselves of St. Thomas.

2. S.Th., *Comment. In Mt* 28:18f.; Id., *Contra impugnantes Dei cultum* p.2 c.25.

3. L. Billot: "The division into the power of Orders and of Jurisdiction takes place according to the different manner of derivation, namely since to the power, which is given by consecration, that other power is contrasted, which does not come from the consecration, but from a simple investiture either of a mission or of some law" (*De Ecclesia* q.8 § 3); De San, *De Ecclesia* n.224.

4. *Jurisdiction*, that is, to speak with right, in its original and strict sense signifies the power of declaring a law or of judging. Then the word was used in a broader sense to signify the power or ruling with its threefold function, namely, legislative, judicial and executive. Finally, in ecclesiastical law it is used in a broader sense to signify every power of the Church, which is conferred in the strict sense in the same way as jurisdiction, that is, by an authoritative mission, as is clear from S.Th. II-II, q. 39, a. 3; *Suppl.* q. 19, a. 3; q. 20, a. 1. See Steinwenter, *Jurisdiction* in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopedie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft* 10,1155-1158. M. de Roulers, *La notion de Jurisdiction* (1937) 34f.: until the year 1210 the meaning of the word "*Jurisdiction*" was very broad and by it the power of ruling was not designated as distinct from the power of Orders. Similarly, M. van de Kerekhove, *De notione iurisdictionis*: *IusPont* 16 (1936) 49-65.

5. S.Th. II-II, Q. 39, a. 3. The same idea appears in the *Catechism of Trent*, p.2, on Orders, n.7-9.

1291. Opinions. 1) Among Catholic authors no one denies that the power of the Church is *threefold*, namely, of teaching, sanctifying and ruling, and all also admit that it is divided into the power of *Orders* and the power of *Jurisdiction*. The diversity of opinion among them concerns the further question: whether the powers of teaching, sanctifying and ruling are *three really and specifically distinct* powers, or whether the *power of teaching* is nothing other than a *part of the power "of ruling or of jurisdiction"* (CIC 196 [1917]).⁶

1292. 2) *Canonists* generally hold that the powers of the Church are really and *formally only two*; several Theologians agree with them, asserting that the power of sanctifying is the power itself of *Orders*, but that the power of ruling and teaching are like two parts into which the same formal power of *jurisdiction* is subdivided (CIC 196 [1917]), although some improperly call them two species of jurisdiction, which others, like Lercher (n.455), Mazzella (n.756), Palmieri (§ 45), Straub (n.642f.) and Tarquini (l.1 n.4) say are *parts*.

This opinion is defended by Palmieri, Straub, Dorsch, Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, Schultes, Felder, Journet, Wernz-Vidal, Fuchs, R. Sotillo and Zapelena, in the places cited in the Bibliography, to which others can be added, like Turrecremata, *Summa de Ecclesia* l.1 c.93; Wilmers, *De Ecclesia* n.166; De San, *De Ecclesia* n.283-285; De Groot, *De Ecclesia* q.11; Mazzella, *De Ecclesia* n.755-756; L. de Hammerstein, *De Ecclesia et Statu iuridice consideratis* p.155; F.M. Marchesi, *Sum. Iur. Publ. Eccl.* n.52; and many others, especially *Canonists*.

Scheeben prefers a bipartite division, but he has a singular view in this matter when he says: the Magisterium, inasmuch as it is the authentic attestation of the teaching of Christ, is a part or function of the power of *Orders*, but inasmuch as it is the authoritative precept of the teaching of Christ it is a part or function of the power of jurisdiction (*loc. cit.* in Bibl. n.1284). This opinion seems to contain a slight trace of the doctrine of the Protestants, who hold a *bipartite* division, but they ascribe the *Magisterium* to the power of *Orders*, as is evident from the *Apologia Confessionis Augustana*, a.28 § 13: "The old partition into the power of *Orders* and the power of *Jurisdiction* seems good to us... the power of *Orders*, that is, the ministry of the word and of the sacraments... the power of *Jurisdiction*, that is, the authority of excommunicating those guilty of public crimes, and again absolving them, if after conversion they seek absolution." Rightly Wernz rejects this opinion, *Ius Decr.* l.2 n.3.

Zapelena (p.171), while introducing a *fourfold division*, says: "In the Church there are four specifically different powers: sacrificial, sacramental, teaching and ruling."

6. St. Thomas and Suarez can be quoted in favor of both opinions, as it seems can be established from their places cited in the Bibliography. See I.B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia* th.5 n.4,1. We hold that there is a *specific* difference in the sense given by Franzelin, not in the sense that Zapelena holds along with Wernz and some others; he calls species those which are only *parts* of the same power, like a *sacrificial* and *sacramental* faculty.

1293. 3) *Many other Theologians, and a few Canonists, think that the bipartite division of the powers, since it is derived from a reason extrinsic to them, does not suffice theologically in order to distinguish them formally and specifically.* Accordingly, considering the powers of the Church according to their *intrinsic and formal reasons*, by which they are adequately *specified*, they hold for a *tripartite* division in the powers, really and specifically distinct, of teaching, sanctifying and ruling

This opinion is defended by Franzelin, Billot, Dieckmann, D'Herbigny, Michelitsch, De Guibert, Stolz, Anger, Mura, Algermissen, Mersch and Phillips, in the places cited in the Bibliography, to which others should be added, like F. Walter, *Manual del Derecho eclesiástico* (1844) § 13-27; Phillips-Crouzet, *Du Droit Ecclésiastique* t.1 introd. § 32; J. Bouché: DDC I,684f.; W. Onclin: EphThLov 25 (1949) 176; S. Tromp, *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia* (1946) p.18-19; A.M. Vellico, *De Ecclesia* (1949) p.549-550; G. Phillips, *La Sainte Eglise Catholique* (1947) p.126.138.289-328; F.X. Calcagno, *Theologia Fundamentalis* (1948); and other more recent Theologians, like Nicolas, O.P.: RevThom 46 (1946) 391f. and Congar: RevScPhTh 37 (1953) 751 and BullThom 8 (1953) 1211-14. Also J. Soglia, *Inst. Iur. Eccl.* 1,135.

4) *Among non-Catholics, those opposed to our thesis are all Rationalists, Naturalists, Modernists, and some others whom we mentioned in thesis 3, n.123-127, and in thesis 8, n.337-343.*

1294. State of the question. 1) We are presupposing two points already proved: a) *that it is Catholic doctrine of divine faith that in the Church there is a threefold power of teaching, sanctifying and ruling, as was proved in thesis 3;* b) *that the power of the Church is conferred on a subject in two ways, namely, partly by sacred Ordination, and partly by an authoritative mission, and hence that hierarchical power is rightly divided into two genera, that is, by reason of Orders and by reason of jurisdiction:* we suppose that it is a *defined doctrine of faith, concerning the hierarchy* by reason of Orders, in the *Council of Trent*: D 1776f., 1767-1770; but *concerning the hierarchy* by reason of jurisdiction, in *Vatican Council I*: D 3060, 3062, 3064; see CIC 108 § 3, as we proved in thesis 8. What we have already proved in theses 3 and 8 we are not considering here.

2) *In this thesis we assert two things:* a) *In the first part, we say that the threefold power of the Church, namely, of teaching, sanctifying and ruling, is the primary law of the Church.* b) *In the second part, we hold that these powers of the Church are three really and specifically distinct powers.* The hinge of the question concerns the powers of *teaching and ruling*, which we do not say are *divided*, but *distinct*, and with Franzelin we hold that they are *formally and specifically distinct*.

1295. Doctrine of the Church. The assertion of the *first part* we find especially in the *Encyclical Letters* of Leo XIII "*Satis cognitum*" and Pius XII "*Mystici Corporis*," as will be made clear from the proof of this part. In addition, there are the solemn *Allocutions* "*Si diligis*" and "*Magnificate Dominum*," addressed to all the Bishops of the world gathered together in Rome, in which Pius XII "one by one explained those things which with the threefold office and prerogative belong by divine institution to the Bishops as successors of the Apostle under the authority of the Roman Pontiff, that is, Magisterium, Priesthood, Government": AAS 46 (1954) 313-318 *on the Magisterium*; 667-670 *on the Priesthood*; 670-677 *on Government*.

We derive the doctrine of the *second part* by a theological argument from the preceding part.

1296. Theological note. The first part is *Catholic doctrine* from the cited *Encyclicals* of Leo XIII and Pius XII. The second part, it seems to us, can be defended *as a certain conclusion*, from the reasons we give in the proof, or *as more probable* because of the authority of the authors who hold the contrary view.

1297. PART 1: The threefold power of the Church is the primary law of the Church.

It is proved 1) *from the continuing duration of the offices of Christ in the Church.* Christ established the primary law of the Church with the commands by which he committed his whole mission to the Apostles. But with these commands Christ committed to the Church his threefold power of teaching, sanctifying and ruling. Therefore Christ established this threefold power as the primary law of the Church.

1298. *The major* is proved from the *Encyclical* "*Satis cognitum*" of Leo XIII in which he teaches:

a) *What did Christ intend primarily and per se* when he founded the Church: "In founding the Church, what was Christ seeking, what did he desire? Namely this: To hand on the same office and the same command to be continued in the Church, which He himself had received from the Father. He clearly said that should be done, and that is what he actually did." Leo XIII proves this from the words of Christ in John 17:18; 20:21 (ASS 28,712).

b) *That the mission given to the Apostles* is not only similar to, but is the very same mission of Christ: "Having returned to heaven, with the same power with which he had been sent by the Father, he sends forth the Apostles...Therefore the Apostles are Legates sent out by Jesus Christ just as He was a Legate from the Father." The Pontiff proves this from the words of Christ in Matt. 28:18-20; Mark 16:16; Luke 10:16; John

20:21 (*loc.cit.*, 717). See S. Th., *In Rom* 1:1 lect.1: "As the Father has sent me, so I send you, that is, from the same love and with *the same authority*."

c) *That the Lord handed over to Peter his own supreme power*: "Christ the Lord gave to Peter and to his successors that they should be his Vicars, and that in the Church they should have perpetually the same power, which he had in his mortal life." (*loc.cit.*, 736).

1299. *The minor* is proved from the *Encyclical "Mystici Corporis"* of Pius XII, in which he teaches:

a) That Christ handed over with his mandates *the threefold power proper to his threefold office*: "He chose Apostles, sending them as He had been sent by the Father, that is to say, as teachers, rulers, and sanctifiers in the community of believers. Therefore through them, who have sacred power in the Church, by the command of the divine Redeemer, perpetually there are the offices of Christ as Teacher, Rule and Priest" (AAS 35 200,204).

b) That the Church *in exercising her threefold power* is a mere *continuer of her Founder*: "Following in the footsteps of her Founder, she teaches, governs and offers the divine Sacrifice. Indeed it is Christ who lives in his Church, who through her teaches, rules and causes holiness" (*loc.cit.*, 214, 238).

c) *That the supreme office also of Head of the Church* is exercised by Christ through his Vicar on earth: "For in virtue of the Primacy Peter is none other than the Vicar of Christ, and therefore this Body has only one principal Head, namely Christ, who, continuing himself to govern the Church invisibly and directly, rules it visibly through his personal representative on earth... Christ and his Vicar constitute only one Head" (*loc.cit.*, 211; see D 870-872; see *loc.cit.*, 227,242).

1300. *It is proved 2) from the ministerial participation in the offices of Christ in the Church*. Christ established the primary law of the Church by constituting her as his minister and dispenser of the mysteries of God. But the minister of Christ and dispenser of the mysteries of God is the Church constituted by Christ with the threefold power of teaching, ruling and sanctifying. Therefore Christ established this threefold power as the primary law of the Church.

1301. *The major* is proved from Leo XIII and from Pius XII in the cited *Encyclicals*, where *the Church generated by this law* is described, so that it might be a *participator in* and *minister of* the offices of Christ: "Since it is necessary that the divine office of Christ be perennial and perpetual, therefore He joined to himself some of the followers of his teaching, and he made them participators in his power... For this reason and by this principle the Church was born." These are the words of Leo XIII (ASS 28,709). To them Pius XII added this: "The Word of God through the course of the centuries uses his Church in order to continue the work he began" (AAS 35,199).

The major is proved also from *Scripture*: a) from St. Paul: *This is how one should regard us, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God* (1 Cor. 4:1). *Not*

that we are sufficient of ourselves to claim anything as coming from us; our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant (2 Cor. 3:5-6). So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us (2 Cor. 5:20). See Rom. 15:18-19; 2 Cor. 13:13.

b) From the words of Christ himself: *And behold, I am with you always to the close of the age* (Matt. 28:20); *But the Counselor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you* (John 14:26).

From these quotes it is very evident that the Church with her powers is the minister and participator of the offices of Christ.

1302. *The minor* is proved from the Encyclical "*Mystici Corporis*" of Pius XII, in which he teaches:

a) That *Christ* himself, *through the ministry of the Pope and the Bishops*, rules his Church: "The divine Redeemer rules his mystical Body also visibly and ordinarily through his Vicar on earth" (*loc.cit.*, 210). "For these [particular Churches] are governed by Jesus Christ through the voice and authority of their respective Bishops" (*loc.cit.*, 211).

b) That *through the same ministers Christ himself* teaches his Church: "Christ enlightens the whole of his Church... He it is who sheds upon believers the light of faith; who divinely endows Pastors and Teachers, and especially his Vicar on earth, with the supernatural gifts of knowledge, understanding and wisdom that enable them to guard vigilantly the treasure of faith, zealously defend it, piously expound it, and fortify it with every care. It is He, finally, who presides unseen at the Councils of the Church and bestows his light upon them" (*loc.cit.*, 216).

c) Finally, that *Christ* himself, *through Priests sanctifies* his Church: "Christ is the author and efficient cause of holiness... And when the Church administers the Sacraments with external rite, it is He who produces their effect in the soul" (*loc.cit.*, 217).

d) That the *Church* with all her power is a *partaker in and minister of the offices of Christ himself*: "For, in the first place, in virtue of the juridical mission by which the divine Redeemer sent forth his Apostles into the world, He himself had been sent by the Father" (*loc.cit.*, 218).

1303. *The minor* is also proved from the Encyclical of Leo XIII, "*Satis cognitum*," in which he teaches this: "As the heavenly doctrine was commended to the Magisterium [of the Apostles], so also only to the Apostles, and to those who lawfully succeed them, the divine faculty was given of perfecting and administering the divine mysteries, together with the power of ruling and governing... All these offices of the apostolic mission generally are comprehended by the saying of St. Paul: This is how one should regard us, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God" (1 Cor. 4:1) (ASS 28,723f.).

The same first part can also be confirmed from the Allocutions "*Si diligis*" and "*Magnificate Dominum*." In which Pius XII one by one treated the threefold office of

teacher, Priest and Ruler, which by divine institution pertains to Bishops, the successors of the Apostles under the authority of the successor of St. Peter: AAS 46 (1954) 313-318, 667-677.

1304. PART 2: The three powers of the Church are really and specifically different.

It is proved 1) as the necessary conclusion of the preceding part.

The powers of the Church of teaching, sanctifying and ruling are nothing other than the *continued activity* and *ministerial participation* in the three offices of Christ of *Teacher, Priest* and *King*. Therefore they are of the same nature and for the same reason they differ as the three messianic offices of Christ, since they are only their continuation and ministerial participation. But the three offices of Christ of Teacher, Priest, King really and specifically differ. Therefore also the three powers of the Church of teaching, sanctifying and ruling really and specifically differ.

1305. *The antecedent* is clearly certain from the proof of the first part. However, it can also be confirmed from other documents of the ecclesiastical Magisterium. By way of confirmation, one testimony will suffice from Pius XII in his *Encyclical "Mediator Dei,"* in which he teaches:

"Christ, as the teacher of truth, enlightens every man (1 John 1:9), so that mortal men will properly acknowledge the immortal God... But as Shepherd he cares for his flock, leads it to the pastures of life, and he establishes a law with the purpose that no one will wander away from Him, from the correct and proven way... [Finally, as Priest] at the Last Supper, in a solemn rite, he celebrates the New Covenant, which indeed, as the divinely instituted Eucharist, he decrees that it is to be continued; but on the next day he offers the salvific Sacrifice of his life, and from his pierced heart in a way he pours out the Sacraments, which communicate the treasures of Redemption to the souls of men... In the course of his earthly life he instituted and determined this sacred worship, and he wants it never to be discontinued. If in fact he has not abandoned the human race, but... rather assists it with his Church, in which his divine presence remains constant throughout the centuries... The Church therefore has a common purpose, office and mission with the Incarnate Word: that is, to teach the truth to all, to rule and direct man rightly, and to offer God a pleasing and acceptable Sacrifice."⁷

1306. *The subsumed minor* is readily conceded by all: for, 1) the offices of *Prophet* or *Teacher, Priest* and *King* are shown in Scripture as *really distinct*, so that they are also exercised by different persons and they are

7. Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mediator Dei"*: AAs 39 (1947) 527f. See J. Salaverri, *El Derecho en el Misterio de la Iglesia*: RevEspT 14 (1954) 260-273.

conferred by different anointings, as is clear from Lev. 8 and 9; 1 Sam. 16; 1 Kings 19:16. But in the same Scripture Christ is described as Prophet, as Priest and as King, analogously or in a way like others, because the other Prophets, Priests and Kings were only figures of Him: Deut. 18:15-19; Ps. 110; Isa. 35.⁸

1307. b) That the *three messianic offices of Christ differ specifically* is clear from their *reason* and *nature*, and from their *formal objects*, which the Lord himself expressed when he said about himself: *I am the way, the truth and the life*: John 14:6. The following paradigm illustrates this:

Christ	as <i>Teacher</i> he teaches divine <i>truth</i> and fosters <i>faith</i> :	} of believers ⁹
	as <i>King</i> he shows the <i>way</i> to heaven and nourishes <i>hope</i> :	
	as <i>Priest</i> he confers the <i>life</i> of grace and increases <i>charity</i>	

In order to grasp the force of this first argument it should be well noted that the *messianic offices* do not come from the power of *authority*, which Christ had *as God* and which therefore cannot be communicated to men, but from the power which Christ had *as man* and which he communicated to men through ministerial participation as is expressly taught by Pius XII and Leo XIII (n.1297-1302), according to the teaching of St. Thomas (III, q. 64, a. 3,4,5; 4 CG 74).

1308. *It is proved 2) from the intrinsic and formal reasons of the powers themselves:*

Powers are specified by their proper acts, formal objects and intrinsic ends. But the proper acts, formal objects and intrinsic ends of the three powers of the Church are specifically different. Therefore the three powers of the Church of teaching, sanctifying and ruling are specifically different.

The major is admitted by all, according to the scholastic axiom: "A

8. Eusebius of Caesarea shows that the *Prophets, Priests and Kings* of the O.T. were anointed with different anointings, and from that he explains beautifully that they are only *types of Christ, Teacher, Priest and King*: *Hist. Eccles.* L.1 c.3: MG 20,67-76. The *Roman Catechism* teaches the same thing, p.1 a.2 n.6-8. You have the same teaching in S.Th., *In Ps* 44,5; *In Rom* 1.1 lect.1; III, q. 31, 1.2: "in a special way Christ is said to be the Son of Abraham and David (Matt. 1:1)... because Christ was the future King, Prophet and Priest (Gen. 15:9; 20:7), but David was a King and Prophet."

9. E. Mura, *Le Corps Mystique du Christ* v.2 (1937) p.2. Zapelena, 2 p.155ff., does not touch on the force of this argument, because he does not seem to distinguish sufficiently the power of the *authority* of Christ, which is incommunicable to creatures, from the *messianic* powers, which Christ had *as a man* and which can be participated in ministerially by men.

power is known by its use because potencies are known by their acts.”¹⁰

1309. *The minor* is certain from the terms, which we gave, of the three powers of the Church, and for the sake of illustration they are exhibited in the following paradigm:

Power	Act	Formal objects	Intrinsic ends
<i>Magisterium</i>	<i>To teach</i>	<i>Revealed truth</i> or connected with revealed truths	To obtain <i>assent of the intellect</i>
<i>Government</i>	<i>To command</i>	<i>Actions</i> leading to the end of the Church	To require <i>obedience of the will</i>
<i>Priesthood</i>	<i>To minister</i>	<i>Means</i> of sanctification instituted by God	To confer <i>grace on the soul</i> and offer sacrifice

1310. *It is proved* 3) *from the specifically and formally different rights and correlative obligations*, which correspond to the threefold power of the Church.

Every power implies some right proper to itself and an obligation correlative to that right. From formally and specifically diverse powers by its own right and correlative obligation we correctly know that the powers are formally and specifically diversified. But the whole nature of the powers of the Church is derived from the institution of Christ, namely, to the extent that Christ positively established that the proper rights should belong to the *Ruler, Teacher, Priest*, legitimately constituted in his Church to which the correlative obligations of the faithful would correspond. But from the divine institution of Christ the proper rights and correlative obligations of the three power of the Church formally and specifically are different. Therefore also the three powers of the Church formally and specifically are different.

1311. *The minor is proved:* From the divine institution of Christ, to one *Ruling* in the Church the proper right is to command and for the faithful there is the *obligation* of offering the *submission of the will* through the obedient performance of the per se external actions, which are *prescribed* in an authoritative way; to a *Teacher* in the Church the

10. S.Th., *Suppl.* q. 14, a.4; see q. 37, a. 1 and 1.

proper *right* is to require and for the faithful there is the *obligation* of offering the submission of the intellect by an internal assent of the mind; to the *Priest* in the Church belongs the *right* to minister and for the faithful there is the *obligation* with an obedient mind *to receive the means of sanctification*, which are conferred in a priestly way. But the proper acts and formal objects of these rights and obligations formally and specifically are different. Therefore from the divine institution of Christ, the proper rights and correlative obligations of the three powers of the Church formally and specifically are different.

Concerning the major, in order to avoid refusals, note: 1) the word “prescribe” deliberately is not used except for the power of *ruling*, for which this is the proper term. 2) When we say that the faculty of ruling is concerned per se with external actions, in no way are we denying that there is jurisdiction *in the internal forum*, but this is not to be confused with the power over the internal acts themselves, for that is *for another reason*, as Franzelin rightly points out. 3) Because it is said that of itself submission of the intellect is due to a Teacher, the obligation of the will is not excluded which the act itself per se demands. 4) And it is not to be passed over in silence that the spiritual character of jurisdiction of the internal forum is attacked by many Catholics, although perhaps undeservedly.

1312. *It is proved 4) from the specific distinction of the things that are contrarily opposed to the threefold power of the Church.* Of the contraries the reason is the same. But a Heretic, Schismatic and Excommunicated person are really and specifically different. Therefore also their contraries are really and specifically different. But contrarily opposed are *the Heretic to the power of teaching, the Schismatic to the power of ruling, the Excommunicated person to the power of sanctifying*. Therefore also these three power really and specifically are different.

1313. *It is proved 5) from the mandate of Christ in Matt. 28:18-19, according to the explanation of St. Jerome:*

“Go therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. First, they teach all nations, then they sprinkle those who have been taught with water. For it cannot happen that the body receive the Sacrament of Baptism, unless beforehand the soul has received the truth of the faith... Teach them to observe everything I have commanded you. The order is excellent: He commands the Apostles that they first teach all nations, then they are to wash them with the Sacrament of faith, and after faith and Baptism, they prescribe what is to be

observed... so that those who believe, who had been baptized in the Trinity, should do what has been prescribed.¹¹

1314. *Hence it goes like this:* From the mandate of Christ according to the explanation of St. Jerome, of the three powers of the Church, some are broader than others and by nature take precedence. But powers of which some are broader than others and by nature take precedence really and specifically are different. Therefore the three power of the Church of teaching, sanctifying and ruling really and specifically are different.

The major is clear from the cited text, for *the power of teaching* is prior to the others *by its nature* and is *directed to absolutely all men*, both baptized and non-baptized; *the power of sanctifying* through Baptism is a medium between the power of teaching and ruling, and is extended only to those who believe; finally, *the power of ruling* is the last of the three, and is extended *only to the baptized*.

1315. Taking into consideration the specific natures of the three powers of the Church, and by comparing them with the threefold notion whereby from the different relations of men to the Church, subjects of the Church and members of the Church,¹² it seems to us that these three things can be concluded: 1) *The power of teaching* in its total amplitude is the power of a *Legate to those called* to the Church, or which is extended *to all men*, both baptized and non-baptized. 2) *The power of ruling* or of jurisdiction in the strict sense is the power of a *Superior over subjects* of the Church, who are all and only *the baptized*. 3) *The power of sanctifying* in its whole fullness, not only by Baptism, but also by the other means of sanctification, is the power of a Minister over the members of the Body of the Church, or which is extended of itself only to the baptized, who also by the bonds of faith, obedience and communion *are united with the Church*; for, the life of grace, which the power of sanctifying confers, of itself only comes from Christ the Head to the members of his Mystical Body.

1316. *It is proved 6) from the fact that the power of ruling by its nature does not include the power of teaching.* The Church to that extent has the power of "true and proper jurisdiction," inasmuch as it is a society, "not less than the State itself, perfect in its nature and law: D 3171. But the civil society, although its power of jurisdiction is thought to be perfect,

11. St. Jerome, *Comment. In Evang. Mt* 28:19f.: ML 26,219. St. Thomas teaches the same thing in the place cited in note

2. On the argument, which St. Jerome and St. Thomas derive from this teaching, see J. Anger, *loc.cit.*, in note 1.

12. See above, thesis 23, n.1018-1055.

in the proper sense lacks the power of teaching authentically and also the power of sanctifying. Therefore the power of teaching authentically and also the power of sanctifying cannot be said to be a part of the true and proper power of jurisdiction understood specifically.¹³

The minor is proved, because a perfect civil society is not supernatural nor is it a society of grace and truth; but the Church obtains the power of teaching and also the power of sanctifying, not precisely as a perfect supernatural society of men, but because the Lord positively made it his supernatural Kingdom “of grace and truth”: John 1:17; 1:14. And because of this, since the power of *teaching* is not part of the *formal nature itself* of the power of *jurisdiction in the strict sense*, God could institute his Church with the perfect supernatural power itself of jurisdiction, without the power of teaching; namely, in other ways by reserving to his providence the truths of religion and morals whether natural or revealed by God.

1317. Therefore, from these disputed points we conclude that the three offices of *Teaching, Priesthood* and *Ruling*, which the Church received from Christ, *formally* between themselves and *specifically* are to be distinguished. However, they are not *divided or separated* in the subjects having them by divine right. For just as in Christ the three messianic offices of Teaching, Priesthood and Ruling were joined together, so also in the Pope and in the Bishops, successors of the Apostles, the same offices are joined together, and in them the powers of Teaching, Priesthood and Ruling are vivified and receive their power (Acts 1:8; Rom. 15:13; 2 Tim. 1:7) from one and the same Spirit of Truth (John 14:16.17.26; 15:26), of Holiness (Rom. 15:16; 1 Pet.1:2) and of Unity (1 Cor. 12:4-11; 2 Cor. 13:13). Hence in the Church there are *three orders* of true and strictly speaking *power*, which among themselves are *formally* and *specifically* different. If we wish to designate these three orders of ecclesiastical power with characteristic notes whereby formally and specifically they are different, we can call them the *doctrinal* order, the *sacrificial* and *sacramental* order, and the *juridical* order, and so we carefully distinguish doctrinal authenticity from merely *juridical authenticity*. However, in no way are we establishing *three hierarchies*, the way by which offices in the Church are conferred is only *twofold*.

1318. Scholium. 1. Arguments of the other opinion. The theologians defending a bipartite division of the powers of the Church propose especially the following argument: The Magisterium of the Church not only has the right and duty of proposing

13. See L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* q.8 § 1.

gospel truth, but it also has the faculty, regarding the baptized, of commanding an act of faith and of judging about the causes of the faith. But commanding and judging are the proper and specific acts of the power of jurisdiction in the strict sense. Therefore the power of teaching is the power of formal and strict jurisdiction.¹⁴

We respond in form, according to the teaching proposed in this thesis, in this way. *I distinguish the major.* The Magisterium has the faculty, regarding the baptized, of commanding the act of faith and of judging about the causes of faith, that is, by command and doctrinal judgment or concerning the truth itself of the proposition and directly touching the internal assent itself of the intellect, *conceded*; by command and disciplinary judgment or concerning the rectitude of the action and directly touching per se the external performance of the act, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor.* Command and disciplinary judgment, that is, concerning the rectitude of the action and directly touching per se the external performance of the act, are proper and specific acts of the power of ruling, *conceded*; command and doctrinal judgment, that is, concerning the truth itself of a proposition and directly touching per se the internal assent itself of the intellect, are proper and specific acts of the power of ruling, that is, of jurisdiction in the specific sense, *denied*.

1319. In order to understand this solution, keep in mind the points that follow. The Magisterium agrees with the power of ruling *in the general notion of power*, namely, inasmuch as it implies a right proper to itself and the obligation corresponding to this right. However, the specification of powers is not derived from their generic notion, but from the *proper act and formal object of each one* which is directly attained. And so the *Magisterium* indeed enjoys the faculty of *commanding*, but *doctrinally*, that is, it has the right of demanding and also *directly the internal assent itself of the intellect*; it also enjoys the faculty of *judging*, but *doctrinally*, that is, it has the right authentically of deciding on the *conformity or deformity of doctrine* with the deposit of faith; but with a *formal object and proper act* of this kind the *command* and *judgment* of the power of teaching are really specified. But *the power of ruling* absolutely has the power of *commanding*, but *in a disciplinary way*, that is, it has the right of demanding *directly the external performance of the act*; it also has the power of *judging*, but *in a disciplinary way*, that is, it has the right of deciding authentically about *the rectitude of the action*, or about its suitability regarding the intended end; but it is very clear that a formal object and proper object of this kind, whereby the power of *ruling* is specified, really and *specifically* differs from the formal object and proper act by which the power of teaching is specified.

But the adversary insists: "A doctrinal command is true jurisdiction, which is nothing other than the right of ruling by commanding the act of subjects in a perfect society." *I respond* with a distinction: A *doctrinal* command is true jurisdiction *in the strict and specific sense*, which is nothing other than the right of *ruling* with a command..., *denied*; it is true jurisdiction *in the broad or general sense*, which is also the right of *teaching* with authority..., *conceded*. Therefore, although *to teach* formally

14. L. Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Instit. Theolog.* 1 th.46, n.456.

and specifically is not formally and specifically *to rule*, as is obvious, nevertheless to teach authentically implies the demand of the assent of the mind or a certain *doctrinal command* formally and specifically distinct from the disciplinary command of a ruler or governor. This doctrinal command directly obligating the intellect itself, which is proper to the authentic Magisterium as such, is founded on the saying of the Lord: "He who hears you, hears me" (Luke 10:16), and similarly the jurisdictional command as such, concerning directly the obligation only of the will, is founded on this: "Whatever you bind on earth will be bound in heaven" (Matt. 18:18; 16:19). The doctrinal command is "command over minds" which is mentioned in Vatican I (n.1333).

1320. However, it should be noted well that the command and judgment *of the power of ruling* in practice often *de facto* is joined together with the command and judgment *of the power of teaching*, since they are dealing with the same *material object*, which both powers touch but under the proper formal nature of each power. This occurs easily in the Church, because *the subject of both powers is the same*. Wherefore in a decree that is *materially one* often a *formally twofold act* can and must be distinguished—one being the *doctrinal power of teaching*, but the other being the *disciplinary power of ruling*. The Theologian of Vatican Council I makes this same point very well in the *Notes* to Outline II on the *Constitution on the Church*.¹⁵

"In the decrees of the Council," he said, "a prohibition or precept must be distinguished from a definition or a judgment about doctrine. For in the first place the Church defines that those opinions are wrong; then she prohibits them as such and sanctions them with serious penalties. Indeed, the submission of the mind is to the Church when she defines something, even if she attaches no precept to it; for we are bound to listen to the Church teaching... The Church in decrees of this kind by name prohibits only the external actions, because in her judgment she can punish only those to which she has attached a penalty," and this is very clear from the formulas used in the Canons of the Councils: 'If any one says, etc. If anyone refuses to confess, etc.'": D 125-126, 252-263, 421-437, 1551-1630, 3021-3043.

1321. *The double formal act—the one of the doctrinal power of teaching and requiring the internal assent of the intellect, but the other of disciplinary power of ruling and vindicating contrary external acts with punishments—is expressed clearly in the formula of the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception of the B.V.M.: D 2803-2804.*

15. I. Kleutgen, *Relatio de Schemate reformato Constit. De Ecclesia*: Msi 53,330b-c. Franzelin said the same thing often, *Theses de Ecclesia* th.5,IV,2,3. Those who defend the bipartite division of the powers do not pay sufficient attention to this, and therefore they often confuse the magisterial act in the proper sense with a merely disciplinary act concerning those obliged to hold the doctrine.

1322. *The Canonists*, in order to defend the bipartite division of the powers of the Church, are motivated in great part by the consideration of the several properties by which the powers of teaching and ruling agree with each other and are different from the power of sanctifying. However, these are the properties which ecclesiastical powers have from the twofold way in which they are conferred on the subject, as we explained in the terms in n.1290. The properties of this kind are treated in what follows.

1323. A. *The power of Orders*, because in its conferral an *indelible character* is imprinted on the subject, then once it has been received it can in no way be lost or repeated. However, *the powers of teaching and ruling*, because no character is imprinted in their conferral, can be lost and repeated. But the *Primacy* can be lost only by its voluntary abdication.

1324. B. *The power of Orders*, because it is *conferred by the rite itself (ex opere operato)*, its conferral is tied divinely to certain rites, and therefore it cannot be increased or diminished or removed by the will of the Minister conferring it. However, *the powers of teaching and ruling*, because they are conferred by the action of the agent (*ex opere operantis*), their conferral is not tied to any special form, and so by the will of the one conferring them they can be increased or diminished or even removed. But the sovereign *Primacy*, because it is bestowed on the subject by divine right, is not subject to any changes on the part of human wills.

1325. C. *The power of Orders*, because it produces its effects *by the rite itself*, therefore its minister invariably must employ the sensible rites through which God, as acting through his instrument, produces the grace which the rites signify. However, *the powers of teaching and ruling*, because they produce their effects by the action of the agent, therefore those who exercise them, in various ways according to circumstances can take care to direct the acts of men so that with this help they may dispose themselves to obtain or preserve or increase the grace of God.

1326. *All of these points are very true*, but they are not sufficient to distinguish intrinsically and specifically the powers of the Church. For all of these properties can be said to be *mere modalities*, since, as is clear from their explanation, all are derived *from the different way* in which they are conferred on the subject, or also from the *twofold way* with which they produce their effects. But these *modalities* do not attain the formal and intrinsic reasons, from which the *formal specification* and *real distinction* of the powers is to be derived. Also, *from the different way* in which the *Sovereign Pontiff* obtains his supreme power of teaching and ruling, some *qualities of great importance* proper to him alone follow, which do not pertain to the powers of teaching and ruling of the Bishops; however, no one from that can rightly deduce that there is a new *real and specific* distinction between the power itself of teaching and ruling of the Pope and of the Bishops.

1327. However, *under a practical and juridical aspect* we freely admit that the above-stated *modalities*, which are derived from the twofold way in which the powers are conferred on the subject, are worthy of special consideration. Rightly therefore do jurists pay particular attention to them; it is of great concern to them to determine the reasons for which the powers can be conferred or taken away, obtained or lost, increased or diminished, repeated or otherwise be conferred with a variable or invariable rite or form. Because of this practical and juridical reason we understand why the *Code of Canon Law* [1917] mentions only a bipartite division of the powers of the Church.

1328. Scholium 2. On the distinction of the power of the Church in Vatican Council I (see J.B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia*, th.5 IV 3, p.55-60).

In the Acts of Vatican I some things occur on the distinction of the ecclesiastical powers: 1) In the discussion of the *Constitution on the Church*; 2) In the decree on the *Primacy and its infallibility*.

1) *In the discussion of the Constitution on the Church*, the mind of Vatican I is revealed: A) *In Outline I*; b) *In the revised Outline or II*.

1329. A. In Outline I: a) *In ch.4, the threefold power is clearly distinguished from its threefold object*: "In the Church there is a visible *Magisterium*, by which the faith to be interiorly believed and exteriorly professed is proposed publicly; there is also a visible *Ministry*, which administers and provides with a public office the visible mysteries of God, by which the interior sanctification of men and the worship due to God is provided; there is a visible *Government*, which orders the communion of the members among themselves, disposes and directs all the external and public life of the faithful in the Church" (Msi 51,540d). The Fathers on the *Committee for the Faith* insisted on this doctrine of the fourth chapter, illustrating it in *Note 6*: "It establishes that in the Church there is a visible *Magisterium*, a visible *Ministry*, a visible *Government* instituted by Christ the Lord, through which *threefold* external and remarkable power the true Church of Christ coheres with a threefold external bond" (Msi 51,562b-c).

1330. b) In ch.10, after having mentioned the triple act of power, also a bipartite division of the power of the Church is introduced: "The Church of Christ is a society of unequal persons... especially because in it there is a divinely instituted power whereby some are ordained *to sanctify, to teach and to rule*, while others are not. But since one power of the Church is said to be that of *Orders* and the other of *jurisdiction*, concerning this second one we teach in particular that it is... absolute and completely full, truly legislative, judicial and coercive" (Msi 51,543b-c). The Fathers on the *Committee* when explaining this doctrine, said: "With these words—*the powers to sanctify, teach and rule*—a general description of ecclesiastical power is given," and they illustrate further this declaration with the words of Gregory XVI, by which the powers of *Magisterium* and *Government* are carefully distinguished

by their objects: "The Church has *from divine institution* the power, not only of the *Magisterium*, in order to teach and define matters of faith and morals..., but also of *Government*, so that those sons whom she has received at some time into her flock she may embrace and confirm in the traditional doctrine; and she also passes laws about all those things which concern the salvation of souls, the exercise of the sacred *Ministry* and the worship of God" (Msi 51,583d.586d). Then the Fathers on the *Committee* declare, why also the "bipartite division" is mentioned "in the oblique [= genitive] case": "In the proposed Outline it is sufficiently evident that generally and in the oblique case the power of *Orders* was asserted and that it is distinct from the power of *jurisdiction*"; and for the sake of illustration they cite this text of Suarez: "A twofold ecclesiastical power is usually distinguished, namely, of *Orders* and of *Jurisdiction*: for to these two members, the others, which are wont to be listed, are reduced" (Msi 51,588d.589c).¹⁶

This is what is contained in *Outline I* and in the *Notes*; hence in it power *from the object* is distinguished as *threefold*, but a *bipartite* division of the same power was also proposed in the oblique case.

1331. c) In the discussion of this *Outline* a few things about this question were said; hence it is right to conclude that the Fathers of the Council readily admitted both partitions of power. Some, however, like Gastaldi, Moreno and Volaterranus, not admitting the tripartite division, wanted the bipartite distinction to be proposed "in the nominative case" [= directly].¹⁷ But others proposed only the tripartite division of the powers, like Arrigoni, Von Ketteler, Moneti, Bononiensis, Liparensis, Troianus, Arrutino and Dionysiensis.¹⁸ Finally, Massiliensis observed that: "the *tripartite* ecclesiastical power is found in ch. 4, but the *bipartite* in ch. 10: one of the two must be chosen"; and he proposed the bipartite division (Msi 51,928d.946c). Therefore, from the discussion of the *Outline*, if any major preference of the Fathers is evident, it seem to be rather in favor of the tripartite distinction.

1332. B. In *Outline II*, revised according to the observations of the Fathers, if there were any definitive or prevailing mind of the Council, it would doubtless be made known.

a) In ch. 3 the *threefold* distinction of the powers appears again. For, in it is taught that the Apostles were endowed with a threefold office by Christ: "*Priests* of the new and eternal Covenant and *Teachers* and *Rulers* of the whole world"; and it concludes with this solemn definition: "As a dogma of the Catholic faith it must be held that by divine ordination some in the Church have been endowed with the power of sanctifying, teaching and ruling, which the others do not have" (Msi 53,309c.310a). This point is explained in the *Notes* with these words: "Although both in the explanation of the doctrine, and in the conclusion, whereby the dogma itself is expressed, a *threefold* power is distinguished,

16. F. Suarez, *Defensio Fidei* 1.3 c.6 n.1.

17. Msi 51,892d.893a.899c-d.915c.

18. Msi 51,832d.833a.865a-b.866b.868d.869a.907d.908a.

namely, of sanctifying, teaching and ruling, still an inquiry is not made into each of these powers. For, the *Council of Trent* treated at length the power of sanctifying or of Orders in the 23rd session; but the power of teaching and ruling will be treated in this *Constitution* below in chapters 7 and 8" (Msi 53,320b). Therefore the explanation of the powers of the Church according to their *tripartite* distinction seems to be intended.

1333. b) But this intention becomes more evident from chapters 7 and 8 in which it treats *separately the Magisterium* in ch. 7 and *jurisdiction* in ch. 8, and in them proves from the proper and diverse texts of Scripture that each power was instituted by Christ, and it distinguishes them from the object and end of each: "C.7.. *On the Magisterium of the Church*. The Son of God... handed on the *Magisterium* to the Apostles and their successors... and to the Church, which he made the most faithful teacher of truth, he also gave *command over minds*, and directed her to proclaim her faith to all" (Msi 53,312d.313a-b).¹⁹ "C.8. *On ecclesiastical jurisdiction*. The power of jurisdiction belongs to the leaders of the Church and to this in the faithful corresponds the duty of *obeying*... and so this power of ruling was established by God himself, just like that of sanctifying and teaching" (Msi 53,314a-c).²⁰ Therefore there is no doubt in *Outline II* Jurisdiction is understood in the strict sense and that it is clearly distinguished from the Magisterium.

1334. c) However, this *Outline II* also directly includes the *bipartite* division of the powers. For, in ch.4 dealing with the Hierarchy, it said: "Among priests, the Bishops, whom the Holy Spirit has chosen to rule the Church of God (Acts 20:28), both in *Orders* and in *Jurisdiction* by divine institution are superior to Priests" (Msi 53,310a-b). And further on in ch. 3 it added: "If any one denies that in the Church by divine ordination the Hierarchy has been so constituted by Bishops, Priests and other Ministers, that the Bishops are superior with the power of *Orders* and *Jurisdiction* both to Priests and the other Ministers, and that all are subject to the authority of the one Supreme Shepherd, the Roman Pontiff, let him be anathema" (Msi 53,316b). The reason given for this definition in the *Notes* is the following: "This decree is different from that of Trent, because it treats not only the power of Orders, but also more fully that of Jurisdiction... Therefore, since in *Trent* (D 1767-1770, 1777) Bishops are said simply to be superior to Priests, in this decree there is an addition: *both in Orders and in Jurisdiction*" (Msi 53,320c.321a).

1335. In this *Outline II* we see several things accurately included, which the Fathers had proposed in the discussion of the first draft of the *Outline*. This *Outline*

19. To prove this doctrine these texts are cited: Matt. 28:20; John 14:16.17; 16:13; Eph. 4:14; Luke 10:16; Mark 16:16.

20. For proof, these texts are cited: John 20:21; 2 Cor. 5:20; Eph. 6:20; Acts 20:28. *The Theologian of the Council*, who wrote this *Outline*, seems to have had before his eyes both the efficacious distinction and the Scriptural proof of the three powers of the Church which had been proposed by Vancsa, the Bishop of Fogara: Msi 51,942a; and also the argumentation by which Valerga, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, defended the same distinction speculatively: Msi 52,358-359.

could not be submitted to the discussion of the Fathers, because, on account of the civil disturbances in Italy, it was necessary to suspend the Council. However, we think that it must rightly be concluded from what they did that the Fathers at *Vatican Council I* admitted both divisions of power, and that they never intended to decide this disputed question, although in order to explain the *nature* of the powers of the Church they leaned more towards the *tripartite* distinction of them. Franzelin says the same thing.²¹

1336. 2) *In the decree on the Primacy and the Infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff*: D 3053-3075. The question about the distinction of the powers of the Church occurs here only *indirectly*. Hence some authors, like Billot, attempt to deduce a real and specific distinction of the powers of teaching and ruling; but others, like Rodríguez Sotillo, try rather to deduce the contrary view from the same decree.²² The mind of the *Vatican Council* can be discovered both from the doctrine on the Primacy and from the chapter on the Infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff.

1337. A. *In the decree on the Primacy.* a) Often in this decree the phrase *Primacy of jurisdiction* occurs, which however all do not understand in exactly the same way. For, many use it in the *generic sense* and by it signify the *supreme grade of ecclesiastical power*, in order to exclude the expression *Primacy of honor*, which only the *heterodox* use: D 3053-3055. The ten French Bishops used it in this *general sense*, when they requested, that in the decree "after the word Primacy, in order to condemn the error of the adversaries, the words should be added: not only of honor but also of Jurisdiction, namely, of Magisterium and of Government" (Msi 51,959b).

1338. b) But others understood the word of Jurisdiction rather in the *specific sense*, on the power alone of Government, like Bishop Epivent, when he proposed: "In the Prologue, where it says, *Primacy of Jurisdiction*, the words *and of Magisterium* should be added. The same addition should be made after the words, *by the power of Jurisdiction*" (Msi 51,940b).²³ The *Secretary* responded to him: "But the power of ecclesiastical Magisterium...both in all Bishops and in the Bishop of Bishops, pertains also to the power of Jurisdiction, otherwise than the heterodox think, concerning whom consult the *Outline* on the Church of Christ, *Note 20*" (Msi 52,10a). With this response the *Secretary* in no way wished to qualify the emendation of the Bishop as heterodox, but certainly he used the phrase *power of Jurisdiction* in the *generic sense*, as we have said. For, the heterodox mentioned in *Note 20*, whom he cites, are only

21. The opinion of Franzelin on this matter manifests so very well the prevalent mind in the Council that you may rightly say that the Theologian of Pontiffs, who played a major part in preparing and discussing the *Outlines of Vatican I*, carefully and accurately explained the same mind of the Council in thesis 5 of his book, *De Ecclesia*, published posthumously in the year 1887. On the involvement of Franzelin in Vatican I, see Msi 49,737-740; 53,161-163; CL 7,1611-1628.1647.

22. L. Billot, *De Ecclesia* q.8 § 1; L. Rod. Sotillo, *Compendium Iuris publici ecclesiastici* n.126a; Wernz-Vidal, *Ius Canonicum* n.48, note 20. Zapelena also agrees with Sotillo in this matter, 2 (1954) 154.

23. Others seem to have felt the same, like the Bishops Guerry and Amat, when they requested that to the words "governing" or "feeding" the word "teaching" should be added: Msi 51,964d.965b.

Protestants, Schismatics, Jansenists, rigid Gallicans and Royalists, who conceded to the Sovereign Pontiff either none, or only a Primacy of honor, or a power subject to the State, or inferior to a Council, as is explained at length in the same *Note 20*.²⁴ Therefore in this response the Secretary takes the word *Jurisdiction in the generic sense*, and therefore he rightly says, "that the power of teaching and also of ruling pertains to this," that is, as two *whether parts or species* of the same generic power, which the cited heterodox men denied. Therefore, from that position no argument in the proper sense can be inferred for either one of the opinions, about which there is a controversy.

1339. B. *In the chapter on Infallibility.* Our question is touched by the beginning itself of the chapter: D 3065. The author of this formula was the *Bishop of Paderborn*, who conceived and obtained it so that it might be proposed to the Council for discussion in these words: "In the supreme power of apostolic Jurisdiction the supreme power of teaching is also included" (Msi 52,6c; 53,249c.250a).

a) There was a long discussion at the Council on the question whether or not Infallibility is deduced *immediately from the Primacy itself*.²⁵ Concerning our question what Hefele pointed out is true: "No one denies that the supreme power of Teaching is also included in the Primacy of the Sovereign Pontiff" (Msi 52,1183).

1340. However, on our further question, namely, whether the powers of teaching and ruling are included under the Primacy as *parts of one specific* primatial power, or as *two distinct species* contained under the generic power of the Primacy, the Fathers of the Council were in disagreement.

Cassiliensis held for the *oneness*: "The power," he said, "of teaching, as it seems, is part of the Primacy and should be shown as part of the Primacy, and at least it would be better not to present it as distinct... Wherefore the words should be omitted, *together with the pastoral office*, because the duty of teaching is part of the pastoral office, not something together with it": D 3072 (Msi 53,257b.258a.260a-c). It seems that the same point was admitted by Gasser (Msi 52,1218d). And only these two defended the oneness.

1341. b) But a strong advocate of Pontifical authority, Joseph Valerga, the Patriarch of Jerusalem, defended the *specific distinction* of the powers of teaching and ruling as included under the generic power of the Primacy: "There is a twofold power of the Pontiff, one of Ruling and the other of Teaching; each one has its own proper object and tends towards its own effects, and each one in its own order is fully asserted

24. You can see this note 20 in Msi 51,580-597.

25. The necessary inclusion of Infallibility in the Primacy was denied by Rauscher, MacHalle, Ramadié Colet, Hefele, and other Fathers of the Council (Msi 52,107b.785c-d.1016a-b.1124b-c.1183b-c); but it was defended by Nobili-Vitelleschi, Parmensis, Paderbornensis, Casalensis, and others (Msi 52,809d.810a-c.881b.937a-c.947b). Finally the Council, refraining from decided this question, defined that "infallibility is the prerogative that the only begotten Son of God deigned to join to the highest pastoral office": D 3072. The outstanding Theologian of the same Council, Franzelin, accurately explain for us the meaning of the definition, which touches on our question, *loc.cit.*, in n.1328.

by the Fathers of Lyons II and Florence, and no Catholic has doubts about this... The power of Ruling is ordained to securing external obedience... But the power of Teaching in matters of faith is ordained not to securing merely extrinsic obedience, like the power of Ruling, but to exacting internal and sincere assent of the mind, whose formal reason is not found anywhere else but in the authority of the Magisterium" (Msi 52,358c-359b).

Cardinal Rauscher insisted on the same distinction: "Since in the Outline it is asserted that, in the supreme power of jurisdiction, the supreme power of Magisterium is also included; above all I wish to point out that, between the power of ruling the Church or of Government and the power of teaching the faithful or of the Magisterium, a distinction must be made... He would err who thinks that the obligation correlative to the right of the Church to govern in no way is referred to the sense of the mind, but principally and proximately demands the external act of obedience; but the total efficacy of the Magisterium depends on the internal act of assent" (Msi 52,725a-b). The Archbishop of *Granada* answered him: "These words did not please the Eminent Speaker, because he says, in this paragraph the power of ruling is confused with the power of teaching. But it is clear that these powers are not confused in this paragraph, but *are joined together*, because both the power of ruling and the power of teaching are really *joined together* in the Roman Pontiff" (Msi 52,823c-824c). In this answer, as is clear, the distinction of both powers is maintained.

1342. c) Moved by the reasons presented especially by Valerga, the Bishop of Paderborn proposed to correct the formula which he had composed. In the new redaction the word *Jurisdiction* disappeared: "The supreme power of Teaching is also included in the apostolic Primacy" (Msi 52,1122c). With this change the revised Outline was "very pleasing" to all (Msi 53,264c.265a-c). This formula was approved definitively: D 3065. When the discussion was over, seven days before its solemn proclamation, the *Secretary*, Bishop Gasser, explained it, saying: α) "The Supreme Magisterium of the Pontiff is a part of his Jurisdiction, for his Jurisdiction is manifested by his two keys, that is, by the key of knowledge and by the key of power" (Msi 52,1218d). How are these two to be understood? About two parts making up the same *species*, or about two species included under the same *genus* of power? It seems that the *Secretary* himself gave the answer somewhat further on, saying: β) "We deduce from the Primacy the supreme power of teaching, *as a species from its genus*, and from the supreme power of teaching, paying respect to its purpose and to the promises of Christ, we deduce the infallibility. Therefore actually no vicious circle is present" (Msi 52,1220d.1221a).²⁶

Therefore it seems to us that one must conclude that, from the decree on the Pri-

26. Bishop Gasser used the distinction of *the two keys*, namely, the key of knowledge and the key of power in the same sense as it occurs in Suarez, *Defensio Fidei* 1.6 c.7 n.4; *De Religione* tr.10 l.3 c.4 n.11; *De Paenitentia* d.16 s.4 n.4f. At the Council Cardinal Guidi mentioned it in the same sense: Msi 52,744b. John de Turrecremata, *Summa de Ecclesia* l.1 c.93 concl.8f., distinguished these two keys as belonging to the same power of judging.

macy and the Infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff, no argument in the proper sense can be made in favor of either opinion, although among the Fathers of the Council certainly the majority held the *real and specific* distinction of the three powers.²⁷

1343. Scholium 3. The teaching of Father Franzelin on the threefold power.

Protestants also hold the ancient twofold division of powers, but so that they include the *Magisterium* under the power of *Orders*, as is clear from the words of the *Apologia Confessionis Augustana*, cited in n.1292, and from Melanchthon.²⁸

Against this interpretation of the Protestants, Walter developed the doctrine on the tripartite division of the powers, which then Phillips evolved further. However, undeservedly both rejected the twofold division which was classical in the Scholastics.²⁹

Franzelin treated this whole matter according to the *principles of Theology* in a fundamental way, and he rightly holds the following: 1) the twofold division, rightly understood, must by all means be retained; 2) in it Jurisdiction must be understood in the *generic* sense, and therefore in itself it includes two *distinct species* of power, the one of *ruling* or “of jurisdiction said *specifically*,” but the other of *teaching* or of *Magisterium*; 3) however, *for theological reasons* it must be admitted that there is also a *threefold distinct power*, corresponding to the *threefold messianic office of Christ of Teacher, Priest and King*; 4) finally, the powers of *Magisterium* and *Ruling* are not divided, but *joined together* in the subject on whom they are conferred, and so in the definition itself of the supreme *Magisterium* the supreme power of Jurisdiction is also exercised, concerning which all are bound by the office of hierarchical subordination.³⁰

It can be conceded that Franzelin had not yet proposed the notion of the *doctrinal command* of the power of *teaching* specifically distinct from the purely jurisdictional command of the power of *ruling*, as we have explained it in n.1319; but we think this notion is required by the *doctrinal authenticity itself* of the *Magisterium* as such and very well agrees with the whole doctrine of Fr. Franzelin, who also carefully distinguishes this doctrinal authenticity from *juridical authenticity*. In the Vatican Outline the text speaks about “the command in the mind” which is proper to the *Magisterium* (n.1333).

Anyone who attentively reads the thesis of Fr. Franzelin and carefully compares it with our thesis will easily see that both teachings are fundamentally the same.³¹ The main point of the controversy concerns the *formal* and *specific* distinction of the powers of *teaching* and *ruling*. But in order to avoid all confusion, which often occurs in this matter, with Franzelin it is necessary carefully to keep three things in mind: 1) The whole object of the *Magisterium* is also the *material* object of the power of Governing; and therefore it must be carefully noted in every act of power

27. I presented more on this question in MiscCom 14 (1950) 5-84.

28. *Apologia Confessionis Augustana* a.28 § 13; Melanchthon, *Loci theologici*: Corpus Reformatorum, v.21,501.

29. F. Walter, *Manual del Derecho eclesiástico* § 13; G. Phillips, *Du Droit Ecclésiastique* t.1 § 8 and 32.

30. I.B. Franzelin, *Theses de Ecclesia* th.5,IV,2 and 3. (1887) p.46-64.

31. On this matter see our explanation: *La triple potestad de la Iglesia*: MiscCom 14 (1950) 5-84.

concerning doctrine, whether it is a *formal* and *specific* act of the Magisterium, or a proper act of the power of Governing, as we also with Fr. Kleutgen have taken care to point out in n.1320. 2) The word *Jurisdiction* is used in two senses, namely, *generic* and *specific*, and therefore those texts of the Vatican Fathers should not be interpreted in the *specific* sense, which they understood in the *generic* sense. 3) It is very important to keep before one's eyes *the proper and specific theological nature of the power of teaching*; and so that the supposition is false of those who think that, by the *specific* distinction of the Magisterium from Governing, the *properly and strictly authoritative* character of the office of teaching is denied, which the defenders of the specific distinction absolutely hold and more accurately explain.³²

Anyone who examines carefully these three points, which we have mentioned, and carefully considers not only the *juridical* reasons, but rather the *theological arguments*, will easily see that, with Franzelin, *both* distinctions of powers must be admitted—one having two members, namely, *Orders* and *Jurisdiction*, but the other having three members, namely, *Magisterium*, *Priesthood* and *Kingship*, since the one detracts nothing from the other and the *theological sources* demand both.³³

1344. Scholium 4. On the true state of the question in this matter. Although we have practiced moderation and conciseness, which our treatise demands of us, nevertheless we did add something more, especially in nn. 1291f., 1298, 1307, 1311, 1316f., 1343, so that we might express our mind more clearly, lest our adversary “inadvertently transform” it.

*The principle reason for the disagreement consists in the state of the question.*³⁴

32. Sufficient attention to these three points does not seem to have been given by L.R. Sotillo, *Compendium Iuris publici ecclesiastici* (1951) n.126bis, and E.F. Regatillo, *Institutiones Iuris Canonici* 2 (1951) n.178. To them can also be added Zapelena 2 (1954) 151-171.

33. After the *Encyclicals* of Leo XIII “*Satis cognitum*” and of Pius XII “*Mystici Corporis*,” the more accurate distinction of the three powers must be held. K. Hofmann, *Jurisdiktion*: LTK 5,724f., rightly laments because up till now there has not been written “a profound and complete monograph on the concept and history of ecclesiastical Jurisdiction.” See J. Baucher, *Jurisdiction*: DTC 8,1976-96; E. Coq, *Jurisdiction* in Daremberg-Saglio, *Dicton. des antiq. grecq. et rom.* 3,726-31; Steinwenter, *Jurisdiction* in Paulys-Wissowa, *Real Encyclop. Der klass. Altertumswissenschaft* 10,1155-58. On the notion itself of *jurisdiction* many things still remain unexplored. For the Emperors up to Justinian jurisdiction was nothing other than judicial competence. Under Justinian (527-565) it became synonymous with *power* in a very *generic sense*. From the 7th century until the middle of the 12th century the word “jurisdiction” is not used in the terminology of Canon Law: M. van de Kerkhove, *De notione iurisdictionis*: IusPont 16 (1936) 59-65. From the time of Gratian (1140) until the year 1210 the word “jurisdiction” rarely occurs among Canonists and indeed in such a broad sense that by it the power of ruling is not yet distinguished from the power of Orders: M. de Roulers, *La notion de Jurisdiction* (1937). P. Fedele rightly points out: “It is difficult to find a theme so enticing and so unexplored as the concept of jurisdiction in Canon Law”: EphIurCan 1 (1945) 124.

34. T. Zapelena, 2 th.16 p.151-171; I.B. Franzelin, th.5 p.46-64.

State of the question for Franzelin

a) There is a true division between the power of *Orders* and *Jurisdiction*; however the power of *Jurisdiction*, which is taken *generically* in the twofold division, in sacred Theology must be distinguished into the power of *Ruling* or of *Jurisdiction said specifically*, and into the power of the

authentic Magisterium (p.46).

b) The total power of *teaching* and *ruling* considered together, by the *generic* meaning of the word, is and is rightly said to be *the power of Jurisdiction* (50).

c) What is *asked* by us *above all* is this: whether and how in the power of *Jurisdiction* considered *generically*, two formal reasons, the power of the divine *Magisterium* and the power of ecclesiastical *commanding* or of *Jurisdiction said specifically*, between one another must be thought to be distinct (52).

State of the question for Zapelena

a) All hierarchical power is twofold: *Orders* and *Jurisdiction*; therefore the power of ecclesiastical *Magisterium* is not a new power formally and specifically different from the power of *Jurisdiction*, but it is a species of *Jurisdiction*, that is, the power of doctrinal *Jurisdiction* (p.152).

b) The powers of *ruling* and *teaching* are *two species of one genus*, which is *Jurisdiction*. In other words, not only *Ruling*, but also *Magisterium* are truly and in the proper sense *Jurisdiction* (164).

c) *The point of the question* is not about whether these two powers of *Magisterium* and *Ruling* differ from one another specifically, but in this, whether the power of ecclesiastical *Magisterium* is to be reduced to the power of *Jurisdiction*. In other words, whether *the power of Magisterium* in the Church is *formally Jurisdiction* (155-160).

Thus from their words, there is a manifest *difference in the state of the question* between these authors. Franzelin supposes what Zapelena says must be proved, and vice versa. Both agree in admitting a *bipartite division* of the powers of *Orders* and of *Jurisdiction*, and in including *under the generic notion of Jurisdiction* the powers of *Ruling* and *Magisterium*. The difference consists in proposing the singular and proper question, which they intend to answer.

Franzelin above all asks: *How are the Magisterium and Ruling truly and formally to be distinguished?*

Zapelena above all asks: *How is the Magisterium truly and formally Jurisdiction?*

Zapelena contends that *his* state of the question is the *true* state of the question. On the contrary, it seems to us that the true state of the question is what Franzelin proposes; and therefore the conclusion of our arguments is always: *The powers of Magisterium and Ruling are between themselves formally and specifically different*. Zapelena grants that our individual arguments indeed prove exactly what we intend to prove along with Franzelin; but then he says that this is not the point of the question. We can say the very same thing, and with surely the same right, about the argument that he presents in favor of his opinion; but for the sake of brevity we will refrain from taking the effort, which

for us would be very easy, of distinguishing and answering under this rationale each one of his arguments. We will do that elsewhere.

But we will say this one thing—that he insists on the *juridical nature* of the power of *teaching* to such an extent that he does not distinguish *doctrinal authenticity* from *juridical authenticity* and he distorts the proper nature of the Magisterium, reducing it to a mere part of the power of *Ruling*. And so, although he says often that *Magisterium* and *Ruling* are *two species of the genus* of the power of *Jurisdiction*, nevertheless really he does not save the specific distinction, which he affirms; but he explains the nature of the authentic Magisterium in the same way as other authors who openly teach that the *Magisterium* is a part of *Ruling*, as do, among others, Tarquini (l.1 n.4 note), Mazzella (n.756), Palmieri (§ 45), De Groot (q.11, at the beginning), Straub (n.642f.), Lercher (n.455), Marchesi, *Summa Iur. Publ. Eccl.* n.52.

Finally, for him to see that his way of understanding Vatican I on this matter is not accurate, it would suffice for him to read carefully what Franzelin wrote about this, which has also been confirmed by our own investigations.³⁵

35. I.B. Franzelin, th.5 p.56-60; see what we said above in n.1328-1342 and more at length, *La triple potestad de la Iglesia*: MiscCom 14 (1951) 47-84; see also what we have rejected concerning his method and rationale in treating adversaries, in *El tratado "De Ecclesia" del Padre Zapelena*: EstEcl 29 (1955) 217-231.

CONCLUSION

CHRIST IN THE CHURCH

1345. Since Christ the Lord and Redeemer said: *I am the way, the truth and the life* (John 14:6), we can conclude rightly with Saint Cyprian: "Therefore we have Christ as *the Leader of our journey, the Source of light, the Author of salvation.*"¹ Indeed, "Christ handed on the same office and the same mission to be continued in the Church, which He had received from the Father" (Leo XIII).² Therefore "through those who possess the sacred power in the Church the functions of Christ as *Teacher, King and Priest* endure throughout the ages, and it is Christ himself who lives in his Church and through her teaches, rules, and bestows holiness" (Pius XII),³ "*for building up the body of Christ, so that speaking the truth in love we may grow up in every way into him who is the Head, into Christ*" (Eph. 4:12.15). To Him be Glory and Dominion forever and ever: Amen (1 Pet. 5:11; Rev. 1:6).

1. St. Cyprian, *Quod idola dii non sint* c.15, conclusion: ML 4,602; ed. Hartel: CSEL 3,1 p.31. On the nature of this work of St. Cyprian, see R 549; B. Steidle, *Patrologia* § 28,1,a; B. Altaner, *Patrologia* § 34,A,2.

2. Leo XIII, *Encycl. "Satis cognitum"*: ASS 28 (1896) 712.

3. Pius XII, *Encycl. "Mystici Corporis"*: AAS 35 (1943) 200,238.

TREATISE IV

ON HOLY SCRIPTURE

FUNDAMENTAL
DOGMATIC TREATISE

by
Michaele Nicolau, S.J.

Translated from Latin by
Kenneth Baker, S.J.

INTRODUCTION

General Bibliography

1. Besides the authors who treat all of Theology, whom we mentioned in the *Introduction to Theology*, n.34ff., and besides several who develop Fundamental Theology, whom we cited *ibid.* in n.62, now the following are to be mentioned in particular:

a) Ecclesiastical documents.

Benedict XV, *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"* (September 15, 1920) on the birthday of *St. Jerome, Doctor of the Church*: AAS 12 (1920) 385-422; EB 444-495 [457-508].

Leo XIII, *Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus"* (November 18, 1893) on the study of *Holy Scripture*: ASS 26 (1893-1894) 269-292; EB 81-134 [66-119].

Pius XII, *Encyclical "Divino afflante Spiritu"* (September 30, 1943) on opportunely promoting the study of the *Sacred Books*: AAS 35 (1943) 297-325; EB 538-569.

Enchiridion Biblicum. Ecclesiastical documents concerning Holy Scripture published the authority of the Pontifical Biblical Commission (Naples-Rome 1954) [EB].

2. b) General introductory works.

Bellarmino, St. Robert (1542-1621), *De verbo Dei* (First controversy, in *Opera omnia* t.1 (Paris [Vivès] 1870).

Cornely, R.—Merk, S.J., *Introductionis in S. Scriptura libros compendium* (Paris 1929).

Fillion, L.Cl., *L'Etude de la Bible. Lettres d'un professeur d'Ecriture sainte à un jeune prêtre* (Paris 1922).

Gil Ulecia, A., *Introducción general a la Sagrada Biblia* (Madrid 1950).

Höpfel, H.—Gut, B., O.S.B., *Introduction generalis in Sacram Scripturam* (Naples, Rome 1950).

Institutiones biblicae scholis accommodatae. V.1: De Sacra Scriptura in universum (Rome 1951).

- Lusseau, H.—Collomb, M., *Manuel d'études bibliques*. Tome premier. *Introduction générale* (Paris 1936).
- Perrella, Gaetano M., C.M., *Introduzione generale alla Sacra Bibbia* (Marietti 1948).
- Robert, A.—Tricot, A., *Initiation biblique. Introduction à l'étude des Saintes Ecritures* (Paris 1954).
- Simón, H.—Prado, J., C.S.S.R., *Propedeutica biblica sive Introductio in universam Scripturam* (Turin 1950).
- Steinmüller, John, *General Introduction to the Bible* (New York 1948).

3. c) Special works on inspiration and the truth of Holy Scripture.

- Bainvel, J.V., *De Scriptura Sacra* (Paris 1910).
- Bea, Augustine, S.J., *De Scripturae Sacrae quæstiones historicae et dogmaticae quas in usum privatum auditorum composuit* (Rome 1947).
- Billot, L., S.J., *De inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae* (Rome 1906).
- Courtade, G., article "*Inspiration et inerrance*" DBS 4,482-559.
- De San, L., S.J., *Tractatus de divina Traditione et Scriptura* (Bruges 1903).
- Dorsch, Aemil, S.J., *De inspiratione S. Scripturae* (v.3 in *Institutiones Theologiae fundamentalis*) (Innsbruck 1927).
- Durand, Alfred, S.J., *Inspiration de la Bible*: DAFC 2,894-917.
- Florit, E., *Ispirazione biblica* (Rome 1951).
- Franzelin, John Bapt., S.J., *Tractatus de divina Traditione et Scriptura* (Rome 1896).
- Goupil, Auguste-Alexis, S.J., *La règle de la foi*. Tome II: *La Sainte Ecriture. Inspiration. Interpretation. Canonicité* (Paris-Laval 1936).
- Mangenot, E., *Inspiration de l'Ecriture*: DTC 7,2068-2266.
- *Inspiration*: DB 3,897-911.
- Müller, Joseph, S.J., *De verbo Dei revelato* (Innsbruck 1923).
- Muncunill, John, S.J., *Tractatus de locis theologicis* (Barcelona 1916).
- Pesch, Christian, S.J., *De inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae* (Friburg im. Br. 1906).
- *Supplementum continens disputationes recentiores et decreta de inspiratione Sacrae Scripturae* (Freiburg im. Br. 1926).

Schiffini, Sanctus, S.J., *Divinitas Scripturarum adversus hodiernas novitates asserta et vindicata* (Turin 1905).

Stentrup, Ferdinand Aloysius, S.J., *De locis theologicis* (Innsbruck 1889).

Tromp, Sebastian, S.J., *De Sacrae Scripturae inspiratione* (Rome 1953).

Van Laak, Hermann, S.J., *De Sacrae Scripturae inspiratione atque inerrantia tractatus dogmaticus* (Rome 1910).

Vorté, James, O.P. *De divina inspiratione et veritate Sacrae Scripturae* (Rome 1932).

Zannecchia, D., O.P., *Divina inspiratio Sacrarum Scripturarum ad mentem St. Thomae Aquinatis* (Rome 1898).

Lusseau, H., *Essai sur la nature de l'inspiration écrite* (Paris 1930).

4. The place of this treatise in fundamental Theology. After having proved the fact of divine revelation through Jesus Christ, and after having proved the existence of the authentic and infallible teaching concerning this revelation, the question presents itself about *where we are going to find this divine revelation*; that is, what are the *sources of revelation*, where the revealed word of God can be found (see *Introduction to Theology*, n.57).

The answer is given by the *treatise on the sources containing revelation*. And these sources are two: Tradition and Holy Scripture. Thus it became common that many authors treated both sources at the same time.¹

However, one treats *Tradition* appropriately when it is handled along with the living magisterium of the Church, whose one quality is that it

1. The following authors treat Tradition and Holy Scripture in the same treatise, as can be seen in their works, whose names either in the general Bibliography to Theology (Introduction, n.34ff.) or in the special Bibliography for Apologetics (Introduction, n.62) or for the treatise on Holy Scripture (n.3) have been cited above: Thus St. Robert Bellarmine (*De Verbo Dei*, prima controversia: 1.1-3 [on Holy Scripture]; 1.4 [de verbo Dei non scripto]); J. Kleutgen, (*Von der Glaubensnorm [Scripture and Tradition; afterwards on the ecclesiastical Magisterium]* in "Theologie der Vorzeit"); F.A. Stentrup (*De locis theologicis*); S. Aliberch (*De verbo Dei, seu de locis theologicis fundamentalibus, constitutivis aut remotis: De verbo Dei scripto. De verbo Dei tradito*); I. Perrone (*De verbo Dei scripto et tradito*); G.B. Tepe (*De verbo Dei scripto et tradito*); John B. Franzelin (*De divina Traditione et Scriptura*); L. De San (*De Traditione et Scriptura*); H. Hurter (*De fontibus divinae revelationis: De Traditione divina, De sacra Scriptura*); F. Schouppe (*De regula fidei: de sacra Scriptura, de sacra Traditione; de Ecclesiae magisterio*); G. van Noort (*De fontibus revelationis*); F. Hettinger (*Von der Glaubensregel...*); Io. Muncunill (*De locis theologicis*); A. Michelitsch (*De fontibus magisterii Ecclesiae sive de regula fidei remota: De sacra Scriptura, De Traditione*); H. Felder (*De fontibus revelationis sive de regula fidei remota: De Scriptura, De Traditione*); I. Müller (*De verbo Dei revelato: de Traditione, de Scriptura*); Th. Specht (*Die Quellen der Offenbarung*); A.A. Goupil (*La règle de la foi: le magistère vivant, la tradition, la sainte Ecriture*); V. Zubizarreta (*De fontibus revelationis seu de locis theologicis, ubi praesertim de sacra Scriptura et de Traditione*); G. Goebel (*Hinterlegung der Offenbarung in der hl.Schrift und Tradition*); L. Lercher (*De Traditione et Scriptura*); L. Lercher-Schlagenhaufen (*De Traditione et Scriptura*); A. Tanqueray (*De fontibus revelationis: de Traditione, de Scriptura sacra*); I. Mors (*De fontibus revelationis*).

be the *traditional Magisterium*, that is, receiving the truths from others and then handing them on to others. But now we are going to treat *Holy Scripture*.

5. Method of treatment. From what has been said it follows that the present treatise is *dogmatic*, that is, it presupposes the doctrinal authority of Jesus of Nazareth, of the Apostles and of the Magisterium of the Church, and so it proceeds dogmatically, just as in dogmatic Theology; and yet in some matters, as in establishing the fact of inspiration, it is also possible to proceed with the historical or not strictly dogmatic method. But at the same time this treatise *pertains to fundamental Theology*, since it builds the foundation for the other parts of dogmatic Theology.

6. The necessity of Holy Scripture and its excellence. In order to hand on the religious truths, which we have received through revelation from God, surely the living and authentic Magisterium would be sufficient; but without a very special assistance from God *this Magisterium would suffice only in a strict sense*: for, the concrete circumstances of divine revelation would be obscure and with time they would become more obscure..., and the certain truths themselves would be proposed too meagerly and abstractly... However this situation is avoided through books written by God himself, that is, through sacred books, of which God is the principal author, by which he has deigned to make known to us the concrete circumstances of divine revelation through perennial monuments; so that, just as we have contact with God through speech, we may also have it through writings, and reading them would be a fount of grace and joy.

Thus Holy Scripture excels Tradition inasmuch as *it contains truths revealed per accidens*.

7. Now the dignity, praise and real and perennial importance of Holy Scripture is certain from the fact—to mention just one at this point—that Holy Scripture, since it clearly contains divine revelation, is *the soul of all Theology* (see EB 114 [99]). But concerning another excellence, inasmuch as it contributes to Christian life and its nourishment, that will be treated later (n.270ff.).

8. Hence it is not surprising that the study and love for Holy Scripture has greatly increased today not only among theologians, but also among the laity; this is evident in the biblical movement in various nations, in the so-called biblical weeks, in Bible study groups, in “biblical hours,” in commentaries

on the sacred books to promote Christian living, in magazines... and in many other ways.

9. The object of our treatise is not now, as is clear, to interpret Holy Scripture, or to explain some pericopes in detail. And it is not our task to present a special introduction to each one of the sacred books, by proving their authenticity, by pointing out the controversies concerning some of the books, by presenting their main themes, by carefully examining select passages, and by solving difficulties and doubts, if there are any. That is best left to the *special Introduction and Exegesis* of the individual books.

Our purpose will be *to present a dogmatic treatise and to explain the principles by which the study of Holy Scripture should be regulated.*

CHAPTER I

On the inspiration of Holy Scripture

ARTICLE I

ON THE FACT OF INSPIRATION

10. The first dogmatic principle, which must be explained and proved, is *the fact of the inspiration of the holy books*, from which their divine character is established.

Thesis 1. There are books which “having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit have God for their author.”

Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura* p.292-315; Pesch, *De inspiratione S. Scripturae* n.8-22, 377-396; Bea, *De Scripturae Sacrae inspiratione* n.26032; Merk, *Institut. biblicae* l.1 n.6-29; Höpfl-Gut, *Introduction generalis in S.Scripturam* n.31-57; Tromp, *De S.Scripturae inspiratione* prop.1.

11. Definition of terms. *Inspiration*, taken more broadly, is a supernatural impulse of God, whereby a man is moved to the things that pertain to salvation, v.gr., an indeliberate taste for something good and salutary, pious and holy thoughts...

Taken more precisely it is a supernatural impulse by which a man is moved *to communicate with others* the things that God wants to be communicated.

Inspiration can be *prophetic*, if the communication takes place through speaking; *biblical*, about which we are concerned, if the communication takes place through writing.

12. Three moments can be considered in inspiration: considered *actively* it is the action itself of God inspiring; it is an action *outside of God* and therefore common to the three persons of the Trinity, but *appropriated to the Holy Spirit*, like all the works of salvation proceeding from the love of God.—Considered *passively* inspiration is the reception of this action of God in the mind and in the faculties of the human writer.—Inspiration is considered to be *terminative* in the written book.

13. *That God is the author of a book* means that God is the author (in the literary sense) by antonomasia or simply; or that God is the *principal cause of the writing*, and therefore that the human author is the instrumental (of course rational) cause.

14. The two formulas: “*books written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit*” and “*books having God as their author*” formally do not signify the same thing. For, *inspiration* says only an impulse or motion, but *author* says full efficient causality and, by itself, the principal causality. Therefore someone can be the inspirer of a book, without being its author; and, vice versa, someone can be the author of a book without being its inspirer.

Therefore these two concepts do not coincide. Furthermore, “*inspiration*” has an *ontological* priority with respect to “*author*,” since the ontological reason, why God is the author, is: *because he inspired it*. Conversely, the concept of “*author*” has *logical* priority (or in the order of knowledge) with respect to the concept of “*inspiration*,” since we know that God inspired the books *because we know (from the sources of revelation) that God is the author*.

Hence from the effect we can know the cause, just as from the cause the effect; and from either one of the concepts to arrive at the other.¹

Those two formulas, although they are formally different, still in the objective and ecclesiastical sense they are *equivalent* (see D 3006).

15. The inspired books of this kind, having God for their author, are called *holy books* in a very proper sense, since they have a sacred character *because of their special relation of origin by which they are referred to God*.

The *holy* character of something is always said because of the relation of the thing to God: thus we talk about holy places, holy vessels, holy persons....

The relation to God meant here is the *relation of origin*; for, they are books that come from God. Not just any kind of relation of origin is under consideration here, but a *special one*, namely, *the relation of author*, which is proved in the thesis. Other books, like *The Imitation of Christ*, *The Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius*... which sometimes are said to be inspired by God, because in a certain sense they take their origin from God because of the special influx of God in their composition, do not have this *special* relation of origin, namely, of author, which we are now considering.

With a descriptive definition we can now say that: among us *de facto* those books can be called holy books that are found in the *canon*, that is, in the rule and catalogue of the Holy Scriptures.

16. *A canonical book*, as the name indicates, is a book that is found in the canon or in the rule or in the ecclesiastical catalogue of the Holy Scriptures.

1. For this reason we refer to the more recent debates on whether the treatise and nature of inspiration are to be explained from the notion of the author or from the notion of inspiration. We begin from the notion of the author, not indeed vague and abstract, but as it is known concretely from the sources of revelation. See Pesch, *De inspiratione. Supplementum* n.10.

Basic to its concept is that it is a *holy book* (or inspired) *and also has been handed over to the custody of the Church as such* (D 3006).

De facto every holy and inspired book with public inspiration (to be believed publicly and for the public good) must be entrusted to the custody of the Church; and therefore a book publicly inspired must be included in the canon and be a canonical book. And actually there are no inspired books that are not publicly inspired, and therefore entrusted to the custody of the Church and canonical. Accordingly, the holy or inspired books and the canonical books are understood *indiscriminately*.² But if we pay attention to the concepts, a book *as inspired* has the foundation so that it could be canonical, or the inspiration of a book designates the internal character of the book, whereby it has God as its author: but canonicity designates in addition the external character of the book, by which it has been entrusted to the Church.³

17. State of the question. In this thesis we are not entering into the question about how *many holy books* there are, or *which ones* are holy. The question is different, namely, that the proper character of these books (of some, whichever ones they are) is the inspiration by the Holy Spirit or *the influence from God as the author*. But if we prove this, namely, that God is the principal author of the books or if by antonomasia, it will be per se evident that the books are inspired or that God is the *inspiring author*.

18. Adversaries. a) *The Rationalists* who, denying any supernatural intervention of God, also deny this intervention of God in writing books.

b) *The Modernists* attribute our thesis to excessive simplicity and ignorance (D 3409); and they only admit the divine inspiration of the sacred books to the extent that even naturally poets are said to be set on fire by God (D 3491, where the theory of the modernists is explained very well).

19. Doctrine of the Church. This is found already in the *ancient Statutes of the Church* (5th and 6th centuries), which require that the Bishops to be consecrated be interrogated, as they are also interrogated today in the previous examination: "Do you also believe that almighty God and Lord is the one author of the New and Old Testaments of the Law and Prophets and Apostles?"⁴

Please note here and in the following cited documents that the word "Testament" is

2. See the words of V. Gasser, the Secretary, at Vatican Council I: CL 7,138-141.239 at exception 59. On the possibility of inspired books which have been lost, see n.56.

3. See again the words of Gasser; *ibid.*, 7,141b.239 at exception 59 (col.225).

4. This is found in the *Pontificale Romanum. De consecratione electi in episcopum*. This formula is the same and does not differ substantially from that which was prescribed formerly; see EB 30 [23].

not taken only for the covenant or economy of salvation, but also for the books⁵; this is certain more explicitly from the repetition of *Law and Prophets and Apostles*, by which the sacred books were designated.

However, the word *author* is used both here and in the following documents (in which it is said sometimes more explicitly [see D 1501, 3006]) as the true cause of the *books*, and as the cause simply or the principal cause. This is also certain from the whole tradition of the Fathers.⁶

And it is not because this formula originally was used against the Manicheans, who said there are two principles, one good for the N.T., the other evil for the O.T.: therefore it does not prescind from the question *about the author of books*, which is the concern in this thesis. For, as the Manicheans said that a good principle was the author of the N.T., so it must be said that the same principle is the author of the books of the O.T.⁷

20. The same doctrine is found also in the *Creed of faith* of St. Leo IX (1053), in the letter to Peter, the Bishop of Antioch (D 685; EB 38 [26]).

Likewise in the *Profession of Faith* prescribed by Innocent III (1208) for Durandus of Osca and the Waldensians (D 790; EB 39 [27]).

Likewise in the *Profession of Faith of Emperor Michael Paleologus*, and offered by him (D 854-859; EB 40 [28]) at the Council of Lyons (1274).

Similarly in the Council of Florence, in the *Decree for the Jacobites* (1441) where now occurs: that God is the author of the of the New and Old Testaments "since the saints of both Testaments spoke under the inspiration of the same Holy Spirit" (D 1334; EB 47 [32]); and the madness of the Manicheans, who "posited two first principles... and said that one was the God of the New Testament, the other of the Old Testament" (D 1336), is clearly condemned.

Also in the *Council of Trent*, sess.4 (1546), where, like the traditions which "have been transmitted to us... from the Apostles by the dictation of the Holy Spirit," the Council receives and venerates "all the *books* of the Old and New Testament, *for the one God is the author of both*" (D 1501; EB 57 [42]).

5. See 2 Cor. 3:14. Hence since the time of Origen the name "Testament," both among the Greeks and among the Latins, was used to designate the *books* containing the old and the new economy of salvation; Cornely, *Introductionis Compendium* diss.1 c.1 n.7,1,b.

6. For the testimonies of *Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome* on this matter, see below among the Fathers. In general, see A. Bea, *Deus auctor Scripturae. Herkunft und Bedeutung der Formel*: Ang 20 (1943) 16-31: where it is clearly demonstrated that in this formula it is dealing with the author of a book or with an author in the literary sense.

7. Read, v.gr., *Acta disputationis S.Archelai cum Manete haeresiarcha* 13 (written before 350), where the Manichean doctrine is proposed: "But those things which have been *written* in the prophets and the law nevertheless must be attributed to him [Satan]; for it is he who then *spoke* in the prophets, suggesting to them many things unknown about God... he wished... also *to write a few true things*, so that through these also they might believe other things that are false. Hence it is good for us not to accept in any way everything that was *written* before John... Therefore it is not without danger for each one of you to teach both the New Testament and the law and the prophets, as if they were one and the same..." MG 10,1452f. The text agrees substantially with the edition of *Beeson* (GChrS) c.15 p.24ff.; Bea, *ibid.*, p.29.

21. In *Vatican Council I* sess.3 (1870) the words of the thesis are proposed in a causal proposition indicating why the books are holy; and in order for this proposition to be true, it must be true in what is said ("these the Church holds to be sacred and canonical...) and *the reason why it is said* ("because, having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, they have God for their author...") (D 3006; EB 77 [62]). But in the canon (D 3029; EB 79 [64]) the *inspiration* of the sacred books is defined, which must be explained as it was expressed in the corresponding chapter.

And, as Franzelin said regarding this Outline written by him and accepted by the Council, "that action of inspiration was of this nature—that God is *the author of the books or the author of the writing*, so that the arrangement of things or the writing must be attributed principally to the divine influence working in a man and through a man, and therefore the books contain the written word of God."⁸

22. This doctrine, evidently, is found also in the well-known *Encyclicals* on the Bible: "*Providentissimus Deus*" (1893) of Leo XIII (passim; v.gr. D 3293); "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (1920) of Benedict XV, on the occasion of the centenary of the birth of St. Jerome (D 3652; EB 448 [461]...); "*Divino afflante Spiritu*" (1943) of Pius XII (EB 538.556).

Against the Modernists there is Pius X (D 3409f., 3490, 3499-3500; EB 200f. [193f.], 271f. [264f.], 280 [273]).

23. Theological note. From the preceding it is certain that the thesis is a matter of *divine and Catholic faith*.

24. It is proved from Holy Scripture.

The way of proceeding will be by arguing from Holy Scripture, not indeed as from an inspired book having God for its author (for this has not yet been proved and would be begging the question), but *from the Holy Scripture of the N.T. as from a historic source* containing the doctrine of Jesus and of the Apostles, whose infallibility, also of each of the Apostles in teaching religious matters has already been proved.

The Jews were convinced that they had books inspired by God as their author. But Christ and the Apostles approve this conviction. Therefore that conviction was true.

25. A. On the conviction of the Jews concerning their sacred books. In the sacred books of the Jews sometimes God is presented as *ordering* writing, *determining* what is to be written, and the human author carries out

8. CL 7,5220.—Regarding the influence of Cardinal Franzelin in explaining the nature of biblical inspiration, see G. Courtade, J.-B. Franzelin. *Les formules que le Magistère de l'Eglise lui a empruntées*: RechScRel 40 (1952) 318-323.

the commands of God as his *instrument*.

Thus concerning Moses: Then the Lord said to Moses: Write this as a reminder in a book and recite it in the hearing of Joshua... (Exod. 17:14). And again: The Lord said to Moses: Write these words; in accordance with these words I have made a covenant with you and with Israel (Exod. 34:27).

Thus to Isaiah: Then the Lord said to me: Take a large tablet and write on it in common characters [i.e. intelligible for men] (Isa. 8:1). And again: Go now, write it before them on a tablet, and inscribe it in a book, so that it may be for the time to come as a witness forever (Isa. 30:8. So it is not surprising that afterwards they spoke about the book of the Lord (Isa. 34:16).

In Jeremiah we see how the God commands the prophet to write and determines what is to be written: *Take a scroll and write on it all the words that I have spoken to you ...* (Jer. 36:1f.); then Jeremiah calls his secretary Baruch, *and Baruch wrote on a scroll at Jeremiah's dictation all the words of the Lord that he had spoken to him...* (v.4). Afterwards Baruch reads in the hearing of the people from the book in which he has written *the words of the Lord* (v.6), *then they questioned Baruch: Tell us now, how did you write all these words? Was it at his dictation? Baruch answered them: He dictated all these words to me, and I wrote them with ink on the scroll* (v.17f.).

David "*the most famous psalmist of Israel*" also mentions, shortly before his death, the action of God through him: *The spirit of the Lord speaks through me, his word is upon my tongue...* (2 Sam. 23:2).

And, in general, the prophets are said to be the "mouth" of Yahweh (Jer. 15:19) and *they utter the words of the Lord*: "Thus says the Lord"... (passim in Scripture), when *the spirit of the Lord fell upon me* (Ezek. 11:5). So it is not surprising, if afterwards in the prophecy of Zechariah it is said that *the Lord spoke through the mouth of his prophets from of old* (Luke 1:70; see 1 Pet. 1:20).

Habakkuk also says: *Then the Lord answered me and said: Write the vision; make it plain on tablets, so that a runner may read it. For there is still a vision for the appointed time; it speaks of the end, and does not lie...* (Hab. 2:2f.).

See also Ezek. 24:2; Dan. 8:26.

It is manifest that the Jews attributed this divine authority not only to individual parts of Scripture, but also to the *whole* collection. For, they apply the formula "Scripture says" or similar words not only to the sayings which are said to be uttered directly by God, but to every statement of Scripture, so that they attribute the very same authority and therefore the same divine origin to every part.

26. *The profane Jewish authors*, like Philo, Flavius Josephus, bear witness to the same conviction.

Thus *Philo* (born about 30 B.C.), among others, extols Moses and the prophets, as moved by divine power, "*through whose mouth the Father of all things uttered oracles.*"⁹ And the prophet "speaks things that are inspired, as if he were the breath of another. *For the prophets are interpreters of God, who uses their organs to manifest what he wants.*"¹⁰ And Jeremiah "being inspired spoke an oracle, *speaking in the person of God....*"¹¹

Flavius Josephus, among others, says this: "...it is only the prophets that have written the original and earliest accounts of the things *as they learned them from God himself...* For we have not an innumerable multitude of books among us, disagree from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times, which are justly believed to be divine... and how firmly we have given credit to those books of our own nation is evident by what we do; for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them or taken anything from them, or to make changes in them; but it becomes natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain divine doctrines [θεοῦ δόγματα], and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them."¹²

27. *B. Christ and the Apostles confirm the conviction then current of the Jews*, who believed that their sacred books are referred to God as their author.

These testimonies can be reduced to three groups, out of which the argument is made in an encompassing way:

a) Some testimonies attribute to Scripture *divine, absolute and infallible authority*: v.gr. Matt. 5:18 (*not one letter, not one stroke of a letter, will pass from the Law...*); Luke 24:44.46 (*everything written about me in the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms must be fulfilled... thus it is written and so it must...*); John 5:39 (*You search the Scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life...*); John 10:35 (*The Scripture cannot be annulled*).

See Matt. 4:4.7.10; Acts 15:15; Rom. 1:17... and so in the N.T. there is found, as it were, an absolute way of speaking, of supreme authority and

9. *De fuga* § 36 n.97; see Pesch, n.14 p.18.

10. *De monarchia* § 9; see Pesch, n.15 p.19.

11. *De Cherubim* § 14 n.49; see Pesch, n.14 p.18. In general Pesch explains the teaching of Philo on Holy Scripture, n13-18.

12. *Contra Apionem* 1,7f.; *Opera Flavii Iosephi* (ed. F. Didot 2,340f.

value; "Scripture says" or a similar expression occurs about 150 times.¹³

b) Some testimonies *attribute to God or to the Holy Spirit the causality of Scripture, but the instrumentality of the creature.*

Thus St. Peter, the Apostle, on whom the Primacy had already been conferred, speaks in the midst of the brethren (Acts 1:16:... *the Scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit through David foretold concerning Judas*...— Similarly Peter and John, coming to their own in a meeting of Christians, raised their voices together to God and said: *Lord... it is you who said by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of our father David, your servant...* (Acts 4:19-25), referring to the words of Psalm 22 written by David.¹⁴

Likewise St. Paul (Heb. 3:7; 9:8; 10:15) refers to the words of Scripture as having been spoken by the Holy Spirit.

On the Psalm and saying of David (110:1) *in the Spirit*, see the word of Jesus in Matt. 22:43; Mark 12:36.

There are also other sayings, which immediately sound like prophetic inspiration, and at least analogically can be referred to biblical inspiration. Thus St. Peter (Acts 3:21):... *that God announced long ago through his holy prophets* and the following words from Deut. by Moses.—St. Paul (Acts 28:25): *the Holy Spirit spoke through Isaiah the prophet*...—Again St. Peter (! Pet. 1:11): the Spirit of Christ indicated in the prophets... when he testified in advance to the sufferings destined for Christ....

c) The testimonies of Jesus and the Apostles present Scripture *as the word of God.*

Thus God is portrayed as speaking to the men of the present time, since the matter had already been spoken before (Matt. 22:31): *And as for the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was said to you by God: I am the God of Abraham....*

And the sayings of the hagiographer are called the sayings of God (Heb. 4:4); and vice versa the sayings of God are called the sayings of Scripture (Rom. 9:17; Gal. 3:8).

28. C. Classic testimonies.

In the following texts the word *inspired* appears in the Vulgate, which refers explicitly to the fact of inspiration. Hence texts of this kind are used very frequently and have

13. Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.383.

14. For by reading in Acts 4:25 two times *διὰ*, that is, *through* the Holy Spirit and *through* the mouth of David, the second one is evidently *instrumental*, and the first *διὰ* would designate in a pleonastic way the action of the principal cause as being like an instrument or as *the more noble active principle*. See Matt. 22:43: David said in the Holy Spirit.

been called *classic*. However, since we are not using Scripture as a historical source, it will be necessary to pay attention to the original Greek source; and from there to seek our demonstration, and at the same time to prove the agreement of the original text with the meaning of the Latin word *inspired*.

29. 2 Tim. 3:16. St. Paul, the infallible Apostle, author of the letter,¹⁵ confined in chains (2 Tim. 2:9) and not long before his death (2 Tim. 4:6), exhorts Timothy to carry out rightly the office of teaching committed to him, against those who resist the truth, reprobates concerning the faith (3:19); Timothy also has the teaching and example of Paul (3:10-14) and also the *sacred books* (V.T.), which Timothy had studied since his childhood (since his mother was a Jew) (3:15), and which will be useful....

V.16. *All scripture is inspired by God* [πάσα γραφή θεόπνευστος] *and is useful*....

The force of the argument is in the word θεόπνευστος, which whether it is taken as in apposition to the word "scripture" (all scripture divinely inspired is useful), or it is taken as an attribute (all scripture is divinely inspired), certainly *presents Scripture as the terminus of the inspiring action of God*.

30. For the word θεόπνευστος, although by reason of the term could of itself have an active meaning (divinely inspiring), here certainly it has a

15. Concerning 2 Tim., as also concerning 1 Tim. and Tit. (*called pastoral letters*) doubts have been raised whether they should be attributed to St. Paul, and whether completely or partially. Some authors have denied this a) *because of the difference of vocabulary and style from the other letters of St. Paul*: but new words and a new way of writing can easily be attributed to the new circumstances of the author or to the material. In a similar way the difficulty can be solved b) *because the pastoral letters are not now dealing with the advancement of the faith in new conversions, but with preserving the faith already embraced; for that can be explained by the different circumstances of time and place*. Likewise c) *they say that these letters suppose churches already monarchically constituted*: but this is also an argument for the fact that the churches are not being ruled in a democratic way, but in a monarchic way, very much in agreement with the usual practice of St. Paul; and this way of denying authenticity to these letters of St. Paul can be conceived only in an a priori way. Similarly, a difficulty is proposed d) *especially from the errors of the Gnostics, who are described in these letters as already now creeping in like serpents* (1 Tim. 1:4,8; 4:7; 6:20; 2 Tim. 2:18; Tit. 3:9): but the errors of the Gnostics, which are mentioned here and corrected are at their beginning stage and have not yet obtained the force that they had in the 2nd century; hence these letters are much more ancient (see concerning these difficulties against the pastoral letters, D 3589).

Therefore these opinions do not destroy *the tradition from the beginning of the Church continuing universally and firmly, as the old ecclesiastical monuments bear witness to in many ways* (D 3587), which attributes these letters to St. Paul (although perhaps he wrote them with the help of a secretary). See also the *Muratorian Fragment* R 268, lines 60-62; and Gaechter, *Summa Introductionis in N.T.*, n.49.264-269. Recently P. de Ambroggi, *Questioni sull'origine delle epistole pastorali a Timotheo e a Tito*: ScuolCatt 79 (1951) 409-434.

*passive meaning*¹⁶ (divinely inspired).

For, a) not rarely, in fact often, this termination is used in the passive sense: θεόδοτος (given by God), θεόγνωστος (known by God)....

b) From the Jewish tradition concerning the sacred books (see the texts cited above in n.27, and Acts 1:16; 4:25; 2 Pet. 1:20) and from the early Fathers it is certain that Scripture was considered among the Jews as *the terminus of divine action*. Therefore also here it must be understood in this way: Scripture is *divinely caused, divinely inspired*.

31. But Scripture is of this nature *inasmuch as it is written*, for it can have the effects that follow (useful for teaching, for convincing...) only *inasmuch as it can be read*.

A question can be raised about the meaning of the phrase *all scripture*, *πάσα γραφή*.¹⁷ Here without doubt it signifies the *collection* of the books of the O.T., which Timothy had studied since his childhood; and, since it is said to be *all scripture*, therefore it is not just *a book or one sentence of scripture*. But since it is said to be *πάσα γραφή*, without the definite article, more probably it has an indefinite meaning, namely, distributive: whatever is called scripture.

Therefore, the fact of inspiration is completely certain from this text, since Scripture is affirmed as the *terminus of divine action*. Now the nature of this action will become clearer from what follows.

32. 2 Pet. 1:20-21.¹⁸ St. Peter, the Apostle, the author of this letter, is exhorting faith, because he himself was a witness of the glory of the Lord on the holy mountain (v.16-18), and also *because of the prophetic message* about the Messiah, i.e., because

16. Among the profane Hellenists this word, which in the N.T. is a *hapax legomenon*, is rarely found and it is used for the most part in a passive sense, sometimes in a doubtful sense; see Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.4; Bea, *Noiae historicae et dogmaticae* (1947) p.3. H. Cremer-Kögel, *Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität* (1947) 492, and likewise other Protestants, interpret the word: "endowed with the Spirit of God, breathing forth the divine Spirit." But the arguments proposed there are not convincing, nor do they destroy ours, and so the prejudice of the Protestants is readily apparent: that sacred Scripture is recognized because *it breathes divine things*. Also in Origen, cited there, "for this reason the sacred volumes *breathe forth the fullness of the Spirit*," because the prophets were filled with the action of God, and "and the prophets having received from his fullness [God's], they proclaimed what they had from that fullness" (*In Ier hom.* 21 n.2: MG 13,536). Therefore and because they were divinely inspired, *consequently in turn they breathe forth divine things*.

17. See Zorell, *Lexicon graecum N.T.* (1931) 265; Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch* 1,750-754.

18. For a commentary, see L. Pirot, *La Sainte Bible* 12 (1938) at this place; W. Vrede, *Die heilige Schrift* 9 (Bonn) 128f.

That St. Peter is the author of this letter is certain from its title, and because the author saw the Transfiguration of the Lord (see 1 Pet. 1:1; 1:16-18). There can be no doubt about the Petrine origin of this letter, even though explicit testimonies about it are not abundant in the primeval tradition; therefore it was numbered among the deuterocanonical books (see *the history of the canon*, below n.57). See also, Simón-Prado, *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1938) n.927f.; L. Pirot, *La Sainte Bible* 12 p.478-480.

of the prophecies taken as a whole (v.19). Concerning this prophetic message, which otherwise can be understood only *inasmuch as it remains written*,¹⁹ he says that the interpretation cannot be made by one's own reasoning:

V.20. *First of all you must understand this, that no prophecy of Scripture* [that which is in Scripture] *is a matter of one's own interpretation* [therefore what is said here applies directly to *prophetic Scripture*, but analogically to all Scripture; St. Peter gives the reason for this in the following verse, where we find the argument of the thesis:]

V.21. *Because no prophecy ever came by human will* [therefore by the divine will], *but inspired by the Holy Spirit*, ὑπο πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι [led, driven by the Holy Spirit; therefore the Holy Spirit was the principal agent and the active principle] *men spoke from God* ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι, [hence also it is apparent that God is the origin of the speaking of prophetic men].

It is true that the Vulgate has: *holy men of God spoke*, as also some Greek codices have ἅγιοι θεοῦ; but in this case, according to textual criticism, the principle should be applied that *the more difficult reading is to be preferred*²⁰: for very easily the reading was changed from ΑΠΘ to ΑΓΙΘΙ.

Therefore from the infallible testimony of St. Peter, the Holy Spirit is shown, at least with regard to prophetic Scripture, as the principle cause and author of Scripture; but men are its instrument.

33. It is proved from the testimony of the Fathers. This argument from the consensus of the Fathers *historically and purely apologetically* is a good argument for the existence of the inspiration of the sacred books, since the sufficient reason for this consensus cannot be anything but the certain tradition of the Apostles and divine revelation. Also *dogmatically* it is now a completely legitimate argument, and it should be used, since it is certain that the consensus of the Fathers in establishing some truth as pertaining to the faith is a criterion of divine revelation.

The Fathers bear witness both plainly and metaphorically that God is the principal author of the sacred books, but that the human writer was a human instrument in the hand of God. Thus they say that Scripture *"contains divine oracles and speech, that the books have been given by the heavenly Father and transmitted by the sacred authors to the human*

19. St. Peter even before that speaks about the prophets as *writers*: Acts 1:16ff.; 2:25.30ff.; 4:25.

20. See above, the norms for textual criticism, *De Revelatione* n.243.

race traveling far away from heaven."²¹ Accordingly, they call the human author the *lyre* or the *reed-pipe in the hand of God*, or a *secretary sending messages from God*.

And so they testify that these writings pertain to the faith of the Church.

34. St. Clement of Rome: "You have studied the Holy Scriptures, which are true and inspired by the Holy Spirit. You know that nothing contrary to justice or truth has been written in them."²² St. Justin: "For neither by nature nor by human conception is it possible for men to know things so great and divine, but by the gift which then descended from above on the holy men, who had no need of rhetorical art, nor of uttering anything in a contentious or quarrelsome manner, but to present themselves pure to the energy of the divine Spirit, in order that the divine plectrum itself, descending from heaven, and using righteous men as an instrument like a harp or lyre, might reveal to us the knowledge of things divine and heavenly."²³ Athenagoras speaks directly about the prophets: "... we have for witnesses the prophets, who have pronounced concerning God and the things of God, *guided by the Spirit of God*. And you too will admit... that it would be irrational for us to cease to believe in the Spirit of God, *who moved the mouths of the prophets like musical instruments*, and to give heed to mere human opinions."²⁴ And again: "[The Prophets] lifted in ecstasy above the natural operations of their minds by the impulses of the divine Spirit, uttered the things with which they were inspired, the Spirit making use of them as a flute player breathes into a flute."²⁵

35. St. Theophilus of Antioch: "... I happened upon the sacred scriptures of the holy prophets, *who through the Spirit of God* foretold both past things in the same way that they were done and present things in the same way that they are done, and future things in the same order with which they will be accomplished..."²⁶ "And Moses, who lived many years before Solomon, *or, rather, the Word of God by him as by an instrument says*: In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth."²⁷ "Confirmatory utterances are found both with the prophets and in the Gospels, because they all spoke inspired by one Spirit of God."²⁸ St. Irenaeus: "...being most properly assured that the Scriptures are indeed perfect, since they were spoken by the Word of God and his Spirit."²⁹

36. St. Hippolytus expressly mentions something *as pertaining to faith*. [The heretics] rashly laid their hands on the divine scriptures, saying that

21. Encyclical "Providentissimus": EB 81 [66].

22. *Ad Cor* 1,45: R 22.

23. *Cohort. Ad graecos* 8: R 149.

24. *Legatio pro christianis* 7: R 162.

25. *Ibid.*, 9: R 163.

26. *Ad Autolycum* 1,14: R 175.

27. *Ibid.*, 2,10: R 179.

28. *Ibid.*, 3,12: R 185.

29. *Adversus haereses* 2,28,2: R 203.

they corrected them... But how audacious a crime of that nature is, it seems that not even they were ignorant of that. *For either they do not believe that the sacred scriptures were dictated by the Holy Spirit, and then they are unbelievers; or they think that they themselves are wiser than the Holy Spirit...*³⁰ And elsewhere: "Scripture does not lie in any way, nor does the Holy Spirit deceive his servants the prophets, *through whom* he was pleased to announce the will of God to men."³¹ "For these Fathers were moved by the spirit of prophecy and worthily honored by the Word Himself, by whom surely *like a string instrument they always have in themselves the Word as a pick*; by his motion and inspiration, these prophets announced what God wills; for they did not speak from their own ability, lest you are in error about this, nor did they preach what came from their own thinking."³²

37. Clement of Alexandria: "I could adduce then thousand Scriptures of which not one tittle shall pass away without being fulfilled; *for the mouth of the Lord, the Holy Spirit, has spoken these things.*"³³ Origen: "With exquisite care and application *the Holy Spirit through the ministers of the word wrote things down*, lest it be possible that you ever forget the reason why the divine wisdom touches *every Scripture given by God*, including even the smallest letter..."³⁴

38. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, when he wants to explain briefly *important dogmas* for his catechumens, mentions *the divine Scriptures*.³⁵ "And them [the dogmas] the divinely inspired Scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach us..."³⁶ St. Gregory of Nyssa: "The divinely inspired Scripture (ἡ θεόπνευστος γραφή), as the divine Apostle calls it, *is the Scripture of the Holy Spirit...*"³⁷ St. Chrysostom: "But when every race of men fell into great wickedness, then the Creator of all things did not turn himself totally away from the human race; but because afterwards they had made themselves unworthy of his familiarity, therefore when he wanted to renew his friendship towards them, *he sends them letters, as it were from far away, wishing to reconcile with himself the whole nature of men.*

30. *Contra Artemonem*; a fragment in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 5,28: R 400.

31. *In Dan* 4,6: R 390a.

32. *De Antichristo* 2: R 388.

33. *Protrepticus* 9,82,1: R 404.

34. *In Ps I* n.4: R 483. See *In Ier hom.* 21,2: MG 13,536; R 488.

35. *Catech.* 4,3,33-37: MG 33,457.493ff.

36. *Catech.* 4,33: MG 33,493-496.

37. *Contra Eunomium* 7: R 1045. And again in another place, where it appears that Scripture is the terminus of the action of the hagiographers, and the meaning of the word θεόπνευστος is passive: "... moved by God the holy prophets are inspired by the power of the Holy Spirit: and therefore all Scripture is said to be divinely inspired (θεόπνευστος), because it is the teaching of divine inspiration," *Contra Eunomium* 7: MG 45,744.

And so God sent the letters, but Moses delivered them."³⁸ And elsewhere, when dealing with a certain passage in the Letter to the Romans: "...but when Paul was writing, or rather not Paul, but the grace of the Spirit the Letter to the whole city and all the people, and through them to the whole world...."³⁹

39. St. Ambrose: "... and in the divine Scripture θεόπνευστος everything is said for this reason, that God inspires what the Spirit has said."⁴⁰ St. Jerome: "I am not so dull-witted nor so coarsely ignorant... as to suppose that any one of the Lord's words is either in need of correction or is not divinely inspired."⁴¹ St. Augustine: "And concerning that city, from which we are traveling, letters came to us; they are the Scriptures which exhort us to live well."⁴² And again in a beautiful way: "Therefore, when those disciples [the evangelists] have written matters which He declared and spoke to them, it ought not by any means to be said that he has written nothing Himself; since the truth is, that His members have accomplished only what they became acquainted with by the repeated statements of the Head. For all that he was minded to give for our perusal on the subject of His own doings and sayings, He commanded to be written by those disciples, whom he thus used as if they were his own hands."⁴³ Theodoret: "But I say nothing of all those [David's]; what do I care... since all of them were written by the divine inspiration of the Spirit."⁴⁴

40. St. Gregory the Great briefly explains the traditional faith: "Who wrote this [the book of Job] is a very useless question, since *it is faithfully believed* that the author of the book is the Holy Spirit. Therefore the one who wrote it is the one who decreed that it should be written. He wrote it who is both the inspirer of the book, and through the voice of the writer hands on to us what must be imitated. If we were to read the words of some great man in a letter sent to us, and we were to ask what kind of pen he used in the writing, it would surely be ridiculous to know the author of the letter and to understand its meaning, but ask what kind of pen was used to write the words..."⁴⁵ But elsewhere: "But what is Holy Scripture, except a *Letter of almighty God* to his creature?"⁴⁶ Likewise St. Isidore of Spain: "These are the writers of the sacred books, speaking under divine inspiration, and dispensing heavenly precepts for our instruction. But the *author* of the

38. *In Gen. hom.* 2,2: MG 53,28.

39. *In "Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam"* (Rom. 16:3), 1: MG 51,187.

40. *De Spiritu Sancto* 3,16,112: R 1286.

41. *Epist.* 27 (to Marcellus) 1: R 1347.

42. *In Ps* 90, 2,1: R 1479.

43. *De consensu evangelistarum* 1,35,54: R 1609. See R 1766.

44. *In Ps praefat.* 1,2: R 2158.

45. *Moral. Praefat.* 1,2: R 2302.

46. *Epist.* L.4,31: ML 77,706.

same Scriptures *is believed to be the Holy Spirit.*"⁴⁷

41. In the preceding texts where the authors clearly speak about *the prophets*, note that the word *prophecy* often is not restricted to inspiration in the speaking, but frequently can be understood to refer to all inspiration whether of speaking or of writing.

42. **Objections.**⁴⁸ 1. The same sacred books *could have been written by purely natural means, without God being the author by supernatural action.* Therefore this should not be asserted, because supernatural beings should not be multiplied without necessity.

I distinguish the antecedent. The same sacred books could have been written also with an internal character of divine authority, which comes to them because God is their author, *denied*; the same could have been written *in their external aspect*, I subdistinguish: always, *denied*; sometimes, *I bypass that*.

2. But, if divine authority is attributed to the books, these same books could have been written by natural means alone. *Proof:* For divine authority to guarantee the sacred books, *consequent divine approbation of them is sufficient.* But mere consequent approbation does not change the purely natural origin of the book. Therefore even if later divine authority guarantees the books, the same sacred books could have been produced by natural means alone.

I deny the subsumed minor. Concerning the proof, *I distinguish the major.* The consequent approbation of the books suffices so that divine authority is added to them *by reason of infallibility, conceded*; so that the divine authority is added to them *by reason of the writing*, in the sense that God is the author of the books, *denied*. *I concede the minor* (n.78-81). *Similarly I distinguish the consequent.*

3. But by consequent approbation of books divine authority can be added to them in the sense that God is their author. *Proof:* Just as the Pontiff approving an encyclical written by a theologian is said to be the *author of the encyclical*, so God approving a book written by a man can be said to be the *author of the book*.

I deny the subsumed minor. Concerning the proof, *I deny the parity.* A Pontiff approving an encyclical written by someone else and promulgating it under his own name is said to be the author of the encyclical *by reason of the pontifical authority* which that document assumes; but not by reason of its writing, unless the theologian is completely dependent on him in putting together the ideas and so composes the text. But, as has been proved, God is said to be the author of the books simply and by antonomasia; therefore also by reason of the writing. See n.81.

4. Books could be said to have God as their author, if God only watches over their purely natural writing, lest errors be included.

I deny that. Mere assistance, like *the work of censor to see that a book contains no errors, would not make God to be the author.* See n.84.

5. The history of the origin of some books shows that their origin was purely natu-

47. *De ecclesiasticis officiis* 1,12,13: ML 83,750.

48. Some of these are concerning with teaching handed on later, but it seemed better that they be treated here as objections.

ral or the work of a hagiographer (see Luke 1:1ff.; 2 Macc. 2:24-32) or because of the entreaties of others (see the origin of Mark in the treatise *On Revelation* n.279-282). Therefore at least for some books, their origin should not be said to be the result of the supernatural action of God.

I distinguish the antecedent. The history of the origin of some books shows the human work of the instrument used by God or the occasion of the composition of the books, *conceded*; this history weakens the special action of God concerning these books, which is certain from what has been proved, since it has been shown that God is their author, *denied*.

6. *Objector insists:* If the human requests of others truly move the hagiographer to write, as one can suppose in the case of Mark, a special action of God cannot be asserted.

Response. And this motion through the requests of men is only *the visible reason or human moral cause of the writing*, *conceded*; therefore the divine motion and the influence of God in the writing itself is not present, *denied*.

7. *He insists again:* According to some authors, it is not necessary that God act on the will of the hagiographer, but he can use the requests of men so that the book is written (see n. 97). Therefore this supernatural action of God should not be asserted.

I distinguish the antecedent. According to some authors it would suffice if God used those external requests, by which the providence of God thus would obtain the activity of the hagiographer and would induce him to write, if God only willed it by his ordinary providence and his ordinary will, *denied* (for then God would not be the author of the book in the proper sense, since he would be no less an author of things which his ordinary providence governs and wills); according to some that would suffice, if God had *the absolute will* so that the activity of the hagiographer would be obtained, *conceded*. See below n.97. And note that this is the opinion only of some: because in this way—they say—God now has a *special will* concerning the writing of this book. But other supernatural actions of God are required before God could be said to be the author of the book, as we will explain below.

8. But a special supernatural action of God is not required so that God may be called the author of the books. *Proof:* Just as when we say that God commands *through a superior*, a special supernatural action of God is not required, because the superior gives the command and God can keep himself outside of it; so also, when we say that God speaks *through the mouth of David or through the sacred authors*, a special supernatural action of God is not required.

I deny the subsumed minor. Concerning the proof, *I deny the parity.* In the precepts of superiors, the precept is proper to the superior who imposes it (who also can command in an unsuitable way and not according to the divine direction, understood in a broader sense; and therefore God can keep himself extrinsic to that precept); such a precept is said to be God's according to *a certain moral estimation*, because God wants that precept

(unless it is sinful) to be carried out. But when we say that God is the author of books, we are saying that *in the proper sense*, as the documents of Scripture and the consensus of tradition bear witness, and not by a certain moral estimation.

9. The Holy Spirit, or God, is said to speak through the *mouth* of David (Acts 1:16; 4:25...); St. Peter is speaking about the prophetic *message* and about the *prophecy* of Scripture, and that the saints *have spoken*. Therefore at least these texts prove there is *prophetic* inspiration, but not biblical inspiration.

Response. Even though these texts deal only with prophetic inspiration, analogically they could be applied to biblical inspiration; for these are like each other, because one is the impulse to communicate by the mouth, but the other to communicate in writing; thus prophetic inspiration can complete the study of biblical inspiration. But also in other texts there is talk about biblical inspiration, for the Holy Spirit said that through the mouth of David inasmuch as David wrote it; and St. Peter could appeal to the Psalms and to the prophetic message or prophecy of *Scripture*, inasmuch as the Psalms and prophecies had been *written* and remain.

10. The Fathers sometimes speak about inspiration in such a way that they understand it in a very broad sense.⁴⁹ Therefore their testimony cannot be cited in favor of the thesis.

I distinguish the consequent. Their testimony cannot be cited, since they are speaking about inspiration in a broad sense, *I bypass that*; they always speak in this broad sense, *denied*.

11. Sometimes the Fathers speak about *things written through the Holy Spirit*, which obviously are not inspired. Therefore their testimony is not convincing. *I prove the antecedent.* St. Clement of Rome, speaking about his Letters says: "You will afford us joy and gladness if you obey *what we have written through the Holy Spirit* and get rid of the wicked passion of jealousy..."⁵⁰

Response. St. Clement, and we can say the same thing about the other Fathers, here is not talking about a composition by the Holy Spirit, as if he were the principal author of the Letters and in the strict sense; but he is speaking about writings through the Holy Spirit, as *assisting him*. Therefore from the whole context the way in which the action of the Holy Spirit is invoked must be examined, both here and in the other Fathers.

12. The Fathers also at times cite apocryphal books, as if they were inspired books. Therefore they erred in giving testimony to the inspired books.

I distinguish the antecedent. Some Fathers erred at times concerning some apoc-

49. Thus, v.gr. St. Augustine wrote to St. Jerome: "... this was not only given to you, *but also by the dictation of the Holy Spirit*, since in the great and difficult questions, you help us not as playing in the field of the Scriptures, but when we are breathing heavily in the mountains" (*Epist.* 82,2: ML 33,276). Similarly Clement of Alexandria, speaking about those things which have been written by the Gentiles *by the inspiration of God* (*Protrepticus* 6: MG 8,180); and he refers to the words of Plato and Democritus on the inspiration of the poets, etc. (*Strom.* 6,18: MG 9,400f.).—G. Bardy, *L'inspiration des Pères de l'Eglise*: RechScRel 40 (1952) 7-26, investigates the reason why the Fathers were thought to be inspired.

50. 1 Cor. 63,2: R 29.

rypha books, as if they were inspired books, or as to some particular books, *conceded* from the history of the canon; the Fathers erred in giving testimony about the general fact of inspiration, concerning which we are dealing here, *denied*.

13. The testimonies taken from the N.T., from the words of Christ and of the Apostles, can prove only inspiration for the books of the O.T.: for they do not allude to the writings of the N.T., and in fact they did not exist when Christ uttered his words. Therefore the inspiration of the N.T. is not proved.

I deny the supposition. In this thesis we do not want to prove the inspiration precisely of the N.T., nor are we saying *which* books are inspired; we are proving only the *fact of inspiration*. The proof for the individual books will be given from the known criterion of inspiration; see n.43-55.

14. God cannot be said to be the author of many statements that are in Scripture (see n.120). Therefore God cannot be said to be the author simply, of the books of Scripture.

I deny the antecedent. For God can and must be said to be the author of all the statements that are in Scripture, as will be demonstrated in the proper place, n.106-127.

15. In the sacred books there are doubtful expressions, v.gr. in John 2:6: stone water jars holding twenty or thirty gallons; 1 Cor. 1:16: *I do not know whether I baptized anyone...* But God cannot have doubts; for he knows everything with certainty. Therefore God cannot be the author of some of the statements of Scripture.

I deny the supposition. Certainly God cannot doubt, and his doubt is not expressed in the preceding words; but God only says that John, Paul doubted or conjectured... (see n.124,1.).

16. If God is the author of Scripture, he is also the *author or inspirer and approver of the present affections of the hagiographer*, which are expressed in the sacred book. But there are statements that give expression to present affections, which are morally evil, like imprecations (see Ps. 109). Therefore God cannot be the author of these statements.

I concede the major. I deny the minor. See the answer to this in n.124,3,4; 125-127.

17. St. Paul attributes some statements of Scripture not to the Lord but to himself: *To the rest I say—I and not the Lord...* (1 Cor. 7:12). Therefore the Lord is not the author of all the statements of Scripture.

Response. Even in this sentence the Lord truly says *that Paul said...* Moreover, here the text is dealing with the "Pauline" privilege promulgated immediately by Paul himself; or according to others, he is dealing with the dissolution of matrimony through a power mediately divine and granted immediately to the Apostles and to the Church.⁵¹

51. See Noldin, *De Sacramentis* n.520.

ARTICLE II

ON THE CRITERIA OF INSPIRATION

43. Since now it is certain that there are *some* inspired books, that is, books that have God as their author, the question presents itself about *which* books enjoy this great privilege and *by what criterion* they can be recognized.

Thesis 2. The universal criterion for recognizing the inspired books, which must be believed with Catholic faith, is the authentic and traditional Magisterium of the Church, based on divine revelation about this matter.

Bea, *De Scripturae Sacrae inspiratione* n.99-125; Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura* p.344-368; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.583-635; Bainvel, *De Scriptura Sacra*, n.158-173; Dorsch, *De inspiratione* p.212-246; Mangenot, *Canon des livres saints*: DTC 2,1555-1569.

44. **Definition of terms.** *A universal criterion* is understood now as that which can be used in order to recognize *all* the inspired books and generally for all men, so that they can, with certainty, recognize all the inspired books. It is opposed to *particular criteria*, which could be used for some books (v.gr. the testimony of Holy Scripture), or for some men (v.gr. the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit).

It is to be noted that such a universal criterion is sought, which can generate *divine and Catholic faith*, whereby the inspiration of these books is believed. For, the inspiration of the sacred and canonical books is a fact pertaining to divine and Catholic faith (see the preceding thesis n.19-23).

This divine revelation is *the mediated and ultimate criterion* in order to know the inspired books. The authentic Magisterium of the Church relies on this criterion when she hands on the received tradition: this authentic and traditional Magisterium of the Church constitutes *the immediate and proximate criterion*.

45. **The adversaries** are the Protestants who, having rejected the tradition of the Church, are forced to flee to other criteria.

A) Thus *the first ones* appealed 1) to *mainly internal criteria*, like John Gerhard (+ 1637)¹;

2) or to the prophetic and apostolic office of the author, like M.

1. *Loci theologici* 1,3 (ed. 1657 p.22); Bea, n.101.

Chemnitius²;

3) or to the *testimony of Holy Scripture itself*, which they want to be the only criterion of revealed truth;

4) or they selected from a *scientific historical investigation* the origin of the canon;

5) or they relied on the *internal testimony of God*, thus especially Calvin.³

6) Luther wants to select the criterion from the intensity with which "Christ is preached," really according to his doctrine on justification by faith alone; and therefore, according to Luther, the Letter of James cannot be said to be inspired because James says: *Faith by itself, if it has not works, is dead* (James 2:17).⁴

B) *Later Protestants* (that is, orthodox, not liberals, who are not concerned about this question⁵) add to the *internal light, as a principal criterion*, other subsidiary criteria which are either internal or external.

46. Doctrine of the Church. The praxis of the Church was such that already from the beginning she claimed for herself the right of determining which books are inspired; and she did it a) when she designated the books to be read in ecclesiastical assemblies, and b) in the catalogues gradually put together by the ecclesiastical authority concerning the books to be read publicly and to make generally known: some were considered separate or "apocryphal."

Finally, the Church *moved towards dogmatic definitions concerning the collection or the canon of sacred books*. Thus we find the canon of Damasus (Roman Synod) in the year 382 (D 179-180); also the Letter of St. Innocent I to *Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse*, in 405 (D 213; EB 21f. [16f.]); likewise the *decree* of Gelasius in 495 (D 180⁶; EB 26f. [19f.]); *decree for the Jacobites at the Council of Florence* in 1441 (D 1333-1335; EB 47-49 [32-34]); *the definitions of the Council of Trent* (D 1502-1505; EB 57-60 [42-45]) and of *Vatican Council I* (D 3029; EB 77 [62]).

Consult also the *Muratorian Fragment* (EB 1-7; R 268); *the Council of Laodicea* about the year 360 (EB 11-13 [8-10]); *The Council of Hippo* in 393 (EB 16-20 [11-15]); *the Council of Carthage (III)* in 397 (D 186) and in the year 419 (EB 19 [14]).

2. *Examen Concilii Tridentini* (Francof. to Moen 1578) part 1 p.38: Bea, n.101.

3. *Institutio religionis christianae* l.1 c.6-8; ea, n.101.

4. See O. Scheel, *Luthers Stellung zur hl.Schrift* (Tübingen 1902) 42-55; M. Meinertz, *Luthers Kritik am Jacobusbriefe nach dem Urteil seiner Anhänger*: *BiblZeitschr* 3 (1905) 273-286; Bea, n.101.

5. These liberals consider the inspired books as inasmuch as they merely reflect the religious consciousness of the primitive time.

But the Church decided this not precisely by instituting a scientific investigation, but by consulting the major tradition, namely, “because from the Fathers we received these to be read in the Church” (Council of Hippo: EB 20 [15]).⁷

47. The theological note of the thesis is deduced from this doctrine and practice of the Church. For, from the fact that she by herself chose the books to be read as inspired, in practice she says that she is the criterion in order to know this matter. But in our thesis we want to show also that this criterion is *universal*, that is, for all men and for all the books; and also that this criterion of the Magisterium is based on the divine testimony had through revelation. The thesis, therefore, since it appears as the conclusion from the praxis and from the definitions of the Church concerning the canon, is *at least theologically certain*. I say “at least,” i.e., unless someone wishes to find the thesis implicitly contained in the definitions of the Church about the canon.

48. It is proved firstly by rejecting the criteria proposed by the adversaries as insufficient. 1) *The internal characteristics* from the nature of the book (the presence in it of prophecies, miracles, sublime teaching...) also *can be found in other books* (for example, in the Letters of St. Ignatius) or they can be had by revelation alone. Also, such sublime internal characteristics *can be lacking in inspired books* or be very difficult to recognize in them, v.gr., in the Letter to Philemon (as rightly now—after the treatise on the Magisterium of the Church, in the present dogmatic treatise—one can affirm the inspiration of this book from the doctrine of the Church).

Moreover, judgments about the sublimity of some book are *very subjective and indefinite*.

49. 2) The prophetic and apostolic office of the author does not suffice in order to discern an inspired canonical book. For, *there are inspired books that are not from the Apostles* (Mark, Luke, Acts); and it is probable that there were Letters of the Apostles which did not have canonical authority (see about lost Letters: 1 Cor. 5:9; and below, n.56).

If this criterion were true, whenever the prophets or Apostles wrote about religious matters they would have been inspired. Actually, although the prophets and Apostles in the act of prophesying or preaching had the inspiration

7. R. Criado, S.J., treats the history of the definition of the canon in Trent, repeating what had been defined at Florence, and not instituting through the Fathers new scientific investigations: *El Concilio de Trente y los estudios biblicos*: RazFe 131 (1945) 151-172.

to speak, that does not prove that they always had inspiration to write, or that they could not write about religious matters without being inspired.

50. N.B. *On the apostolate as a criterion of inspiration.* Some Catholic authors (like Zarb, Lagrange⁸) consider the apostolate as the criterion of inspiration.

The question here is in what sense this can be admitted. Surely it must be conceded that the inspired canonical books *could not have been written after the death of the Apostles* (because public revelation then was already closed, and the inspired books committed to the custody of the Church pertain to public revelation). It must also be conceded that *the Apostles made known which books were inspired* (since this matter of revelation was of great importance); but the Apostles, in order to know that, had to have the revelation or enlightenment of the Holy Spirit: that is what the criterion holds which is stated in the thesis.

But if the early authors sometimes appeal to the apostolic origin of the sacred books,⁹ it was done because of circumstances, in order to prove the legitimate tradition and authority of these books; not that a formal reason of arguing in favor of the sacred character of the books involves a necessary connection of inspiration with the apostolic office.

51. 3) *The testimony of Holy Scripture* concerning the fact of the inspiration of books can be a guide for some books, but *it is not a universal criterion.*

From the testimony of Christ and of the Apostles there is certainty *in general about the inspiration of the Old Testament*, since they quote it under the formula "it is written." But there are not citations in the N.T. for all the books of the O.T., so that in this way their inspiration is certain from Holy Scripture itself; nor were the opinions of the Jews about the extent of the canon sufficiently clear.¹⁰

From the testimony of St. Peter (2 Pet. 3:15f.) the *Letters of St. Paul* are on the same level as the other Scriptures, but it is not established from that how many Letters there are or which ones are his.

Concerning the inspiration of the book of Revelation, it is certain from

8. S.M. Zarb, *De criterio inspirationis et canonicitatis SS. Librorum*: DivThom (Pi) 34 (1931) 147-186; M.-J. Lagrange, *Histoire ancienne du canon du Nouveau Testament* (Paris 1933) 171-175; likewise A. Durand, *Inspiration de la Bible*: DAFC 2,910f., and others. On this question see G.M. Perrella, *De apostolico et prophetico munere ut inspirationis at canonicitatis criterio, altero pro N. altera pro O.T.*: DivThom (Pi) 35 (1932) 49-61, 145-176 (on p. 51 there is an ample review of authors according to different opinions); F. Ogara, S.J., *Notae quaedam praeviae et de apostolatu ut criterio inspirationis*: Greg 16 (1935) 577-585; Bea, n.106.

9. For example, Tertullian: "First of all we establish that the evangelical instruments have the Apostles as their authors..."; *Adversus Marcionem* 4,2: R 339. See *ibid.*, 4,5: R 341. Similarly the Muratorian Fragment in lines 73-80 by excluding the Pastor Hermas: R 268. Etc.

10. See what we will say later in the *History of the canon* n.60-62. However, note also that the books of the O.T. which are not cited in the N.T. under the formula "it is written," and the deuterocanonical books, were handed on to the Christians by the Apostles as inspired; because they were in the Alexandrian version, which the Christians used, and which the Apostles handed on without warnings about them; see n.63.

the testimony of the author who received a command from God to write (1:11...), calling his book a prophecy, i.e., an inspired book (22:7.9f.) and threatening the wrath of God for anyone who would add something to the words of this prophecy or remove anything (22:18f.); the author would not make such a threat, if the book were purely human.

52. 4) *A scientific-historical investigation* into the formation of the canon cannot be a universal criterion, because it would not be possible for all men in general, but *only for a few experts*. Rather, even the Protestants concede that in this way one cannot arrive at full certitude. Indeed there were books that were not admitted in some regions (see later the history of the canon in n.57ff.) which eventually were held as canonical because of the decision of the Church: and so the question returns as to why the Church has such authority, and what certain and permanent criterion she uses. But if the Church institutes a historical investigation, she does not do it merely under the scientific aspect, but under the aspect of the inclination of the matter handed on.

5) *The internal testimony of the Holy Spirit*, although sometimes it can be sufficient for the one who has it, still *is not an ordinary means*; and it is very much exposed to subjective illusions, as is certain from the discord among the reformers.

6) *The criterion of Luther* is gratuitous, and is based on a false supposition, namely, of justification by faith alone.

53. 7) *Could the testimony of the hagiographer himself be sufficient?* Note a) that this is a question of right, of possibility, and *that we are dealing in this thesis with a question of fact*—what de facto is a universal criterion.

b) Note also that *the hagiographer does not necessarily have awareness of his inspiration* (see n.101f.). But if he were to have it, *he* will surely be certain about it; but this is not sufficient that others certainly will admit it, especially because illusion or error in affirming one's own inspiration could be feared. He would have to appeal to a miracle, which indeed would be a criterion for those present, but not for the whole Church and for future time, unless morally certain tradition would be added to it.

But then not that alone, under the purely human aspect, would suffice to believe in the inspiration of the books *with divine faith*; because certainty is necessary about the testimony of God concerning these books, but this testimony would be had *through revelation* and it would have to be handed on to us by an infallible authority. Hence finally de facto a traditional and infallible Teaching Authority is required, handing on the revelation of God.

Thus we conclude that no criterion of those proposed and of those possible, which occur, and previously were examined, could suffice in order to believe with divine and Catholic faith in the inspiration of the books which are contained in the canon.

Therefore the universal criterion to know with divine and Catholic faith the inspired books can be only *the formal testimony of God given to the Apostles, and handed on by them to the Church*, but proposed to us by the authentic Magisterium of the Church which preserves this tradition.

54. It is proved secondly by considering positively the fact itself of inspiration. If inspiration is considered actively in God, it is a *supernatural* action of God, which therefore cannot be known by purely natural efforts or from the merely natural order, but the testimony of God himself is needed. But this testimony of God is not necessarily apparent through a miracle, if inspiration is considered *in a terminative way* in the book or *passively* in the hagiographer: because just from an examination of the book and of the hagiographer the supernatural effect is not necessarily apparent. Therefore, in order for divine faith in it to be required, there would be a need for some divine revelation or formal testimony of God himself.

Therefore inspiration must be made known by formal divine revelation, which, to be public and require divine faith of all, must be made known through the ambassadors of God (Jesus Christ, the Apostles, the Church), and it must be preserved and explained by the authentic and traditional Magisterium of the Church.

55. It is proved thirdly from the teaching of the Fathers why some writings instead of others are inspired: namely, because these books, and only these have been handed on for this use.

This of course becomes clear from the way in which the Fathers examined the authenticity of the Gospels (see in the *Treatise on Revelation*, book 2), while relying on secure traditions in order to accept them for reading.

And in general the words of St. Cyril of Jerusalem should be listened to: "Read the 22 books of these [Scriptures], and they have nothing in common with the apocryphal writings. Meditate and ponder diligently only those books, which we also read in the Church with certain confidence; the Apostles and ancient Bishops were much more prudent and religious than you are—the leaders of the Church who handed them on to you...."¹¹ Similarly St. Augustine: "Surely concerning the apocryphal books he

11. *Catecheses* 4,35: R 819.

[the adversary] gave testimony that they were written under the names of Andrew and John. But if they were from them, they would have been received by the Church, which from their time by the certain succession of the Bishops has continued successively down to our own times."¹²

See also what we will say later on in the *History of the canon* (n.63ff.), and also the authors who, like Bea n.115-121, explain this teaching of the Fathers throughout the different churches.¹³

56. Scholium. *Whether an inspired book could be lost.*¹⁴ This matter is obscure, and there is disagreement about it among the experts; and the Church has not defined anything concerning this question.

It seems that the following should be said: 1) If an inspired book was not *canonical*, i.e., handed over to the custody of the Church: *probably* it could perish, because it is probable that there existed lost inspired Letters, v.gr., another letter to the Corinthians, besides 1 and 2 Cor., as St. Paul says: *I wrote to you in my letter not to associate with sexually immoral persons* (1 Cor. 5:9); also another to the Church of Laodicea, concerning which St. Paul says to the Colossians:... *have it read* [this letter] *also in the church of the Laodiceans; and see that you read also the letter from Laodicea* (Col. 4:16).—But *this is not certain*, because the Greek authors deny the existence of a third letter to the Corinthians, and those words *I wrote to you in my letter*... refer to the same letter, to the preceding statement (5:2) about the incestuous man. Likewise, the letter to the Laodiceans is understood by others to be about one of our other canonical letters, which either was written from the city of Laodicea or like an encyclical it was read and the Laodiceans were to send it to the Colossians, or finally it can be understood as a letter written by the Laodiceans themselves.

2) *If an inspired book was handed over to the custody of the Church*, the existence of the book and the truths contained in it were truths pertaining to the deposit of revelation; and, although truths of lesser importance could be lost (for example, numbers, chronology, profane names or purely scientific things in the O.T.) because of the temporal purpose which was involved in their revelation (see n.121, objection 23), but it seems to be more difficult to be able to admit the loss of a whole book. However, Franzelin has a different opinion.¹⁵

12. *Contra adversarium Legis et Prophetarum* 1,20,39: R 1896.

13. See also v.gr. Tertullian, *De praescriptione* c.36: R 297; *Adversus Marcionem* 4,5: R341; and St. Augustine, *Contra epistolam Manichaei* 5,6 (where he has the famous saying: "But I would not believe the Gospel except as moved by the authority of the Catholic Church": R 1581; also *De doctrina christiana* 2,8,12: R 1584; *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 33,6: R 1607.

14. See Pesch, n.588-590; Bea, n.125.

15. *De Deo Trino* (1895) th.4 n.1 p.37.

ARTICLE III

SUMMARY OF THE HISTORY OF THE CANON

In accordance with the criteria of inspiration we will now treat the *canon* of the sacred books and its history.

Io. Ruwet, *Instit. biblicae* 1.1.2 (we follow this author especially in what we will not explain); Cornely-Merk, *Introductionis Compendium* diss.1; Höpfl-Gut, *Introductio generalis* part 2 c.1; Prado, *Propedeutica* 1.1 c.2; E. Mangelot, *Canon des livres saints*: DTC 2, 1550-1605; more briefly, Id., *Canon catholique des Saintes Ecritures*: DAFC 1,435-455; F. Vigouroux, *Canon des Ecritures*: DB 2,134-184; S. Zarb, O.P., *De historia canonis utriusque Testamenti*? Rome 1934).

57. Definition of terms. The word *canon* means the same thing as a *rule*; and so one speaks, v.gr., about the canon of faith, i.e., the rule or norm of faith. In a derived sense, *canon of the sacred books* refers to the collection of the sacred books or a catalogue of them, by which it is determined or regulated which books have been entrusted to the Church and are the rule of inspired truth.

The protocanonical books are said to be those about whose canonicity there has been no doubt in any Church; that is, never and nowhere has there been any doubt about them. Otherwise they are said to be deuterocanonical, that is, those books about whose inspiration *at some time or somewhere* there has been doubt.

The deuterocanonical books are the following: in the O.T. *Tobit*, *Judith*, *Wisdom*, *Sirach*, *Baruch*, *1 and 2 Maccabees*, certain fragments from *Esther* (in the Vulgate 10:4—16:24), likewise from *Daniel* (3:24-90; 13; 14); in the N.T. the following letters: *Hebrews*, *James*, *2 Peter*, *2 and 3 John*, *Jude*, and also the book of *Revelation*.

The apocryphal books are the ones, of course similar to the inspired books because of the content and title, but which the Church refused to accept; therefore they had to remain secret (apocryphal), and they were not to be divulged and made public. Protestants call these books pseudepigraphous, and they reserve the name “apocryphal” for the deuterocanonical books.

58. Note the following points.¹ If we want to present the history of the Christian canon of the sacred books now, surely it will not be expected that the apostolic Fathers already used the word “canon,” or had an explicit concept of it. For, the formal listing of the sacred books, or the canon, after some books appeared which had been excluded from the canon, or errors

1. See Gaechter, *Summa Introductionis in N.T.* n.42.

about this matter began to be made public. So it will not be surprising if a heretic, Marcion (about the year 140), established the first *express* canon, of course according to his own tastes, against which afterwards the ecclesiastical authority opposed its own canon (see however n.70).

Thus we will find, by reason of the doubts or disputes, *definitions of the Church* concerning the collection or canon of the sacred books, which we indicated above in n.46.

However, the Church in making these definitions did not declare some books to be sacred which before that time were not such, as if by innovating something; but she declared explicitly *the faith already handed on before*. And, as is said generally about the development of dogma, the change or development of dogma took place insofar as a clearer knowledge replaced what was less clear and the explicit proposition of the matter was made more solemnly.

But in order to explain the differences and doubts about this in the various churches, please note that the structure of the universal Church in the first centuries was of such a nature that all could not be provided for and governed quickly by the Roman Pontiff as they can be today. Furthermore, not all the books of the N.T. were known and diffused with the same speed.

On the canon of the Old Testament

59. A. Among Jews. The catalogue of the sacred books of the O.T. is not found before Christ; but there are some signs that an authentic collection of their books, which they recognized as sacred, did exist.

Thus the collection regarding the *Law* is indicated in Deut. 31:9-13, 24-26; 1 Sam. 10:25; 2 Kings 23:1-3; 2 Chron. 34:29-32; Neh. 8:8f.

Regarding the *later writings*, there are signs of the care of the Jews to collect and save the books which now make up the O.T., in Prov. 25:1, 2 Chron. 29:30, Dan. 9:2; 2 Macc. 2:13f.; Sir. 47:11f.17f.; 49:13-15; and in the prologue of this book by the nephew of Jesus, the son of Sirach.

And books of this kind were *esteemed as sacred books*. This is certain about the *Law* already from the beginning from the way in which the testimonies, given about them, speak; it is similar also concerning the writings, whatever they are, as mentioned in Josh. 24:26; 1 Sam. 10:25 (see also Deut. 34:9; 1 Sam. 8:9f.).

This is rightly admitted concerning other books, namely concerning the *Prophets and Psalms* (see n.25 and Dan. 9:2; afterwards they are mentioned in 2 Macc. 2:13, which refers to 1 Macc. 12:9).

Therefore already before the Babylonian exile there was a collection of the sacred books.

60. The collection made at the time of Ezra and Nehemiah (*canon of Ezra*) was in use in Palestine; hence it is called the *Palestinian canon*. And this canon later, in the council of the Jews held at Jamnia (about the year 100 after Christ), was defined and closed. This canon lacks the deuterocanonical books.

It is not surprising if, at the beginning of the Christian age, certain Jews acknowledged only some of the books (protocanonical). Thus *Flavius Josephus* says that there are “*only 22 books, which contain the records of all the past times; which are justly believed to be divine; and of them, five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death... from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets, who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life. It is true, our history has been written since Artaxerxes, very particularly, but has not been esteemed of the like authority with the former of our forefathers, because there has not been an exact succession of prophets since that time....*”²

61. *In the Babylonian Talmud* (2nd and 3rd centuries) there is a listing of the sacred books, the origin of which is deduced likewise up to the time of Ezra.³

And in the *apocryphal book* (4 Esdras 14:42-47) Esdras is said to have dictated 94 books (thus according to the oriental version), of which the last 70 are to be preserved for the wise; but the prior ones which had been written—therefore 24 books—are to be made public so that they may be read by the worthy and the unworthy. These books seem to be the 24 books which are contained in the Hebrew editions of Holy Scripture.

From the preceding books *Elias Levita* (+ 1549) and others desire that the canon of the sacred books at the time of Ezra himself was finished and closed by Ezra himself (or together with his associates). Thus also *orthodox Protestants* admit only the Palestinian canon; but the reason seems to be given in the fact that, because of a lack of prophets (see 1 Macc. 4:46) the instrument of divine approbation was lacking.⁴

62. *The Alexandrian canon.* But others oppose to the Palestinian canon the Alexandrian canon shaped by the Alexandrian Jews; this canon includes

2. *Contra Apionem* 1,8: *Opera* (ed. Didot) 2,340f.

3. *In tractatu Baba Bathra Talm. Bab.* (14b-15a); *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ n.12.

4. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.13.

the other sacred books (deuterocanonical).

And rightly so: For it cannot be affirmed that no inspired book was written after Ezra; for some were acknowledged not only by the Hellenist Jews or Alexandrians and by the Church, but also by the Palestinian Jews, who at one time acknowledged as canonical *Baruch* and *the fragments of Daniel* and *Esther*, *1 Maccabees*, *Sirach*, *Wisdom*, *Tobit* and *Judith*.

And there is no solid reason for doubting that at the time of the translation of the LXX *Baruch* was in the canon, and also at that time that the Jews used the books of *Judith* and *Tobit*. The fragments of *Daniel* were also included in the book from the beginning.⁵

However, it seems that doubts did exist about the more recent books (*Ecclesiastes*, *Wisdom*, *1 and 2 Maccabees*), especially since the prophetic office had ceased. But it will not be proved that God could not use other instruments, besides the prophets, in order to give confirmation to inspired books.

Thus the Hellenist Jews, reading Holy Scripture in the LXX version, accepted the deuterocanonical books along with the protocanonical, without making any distinction about their authority; this is certain from the earliest Christian Greek codices, which reflect what was in the Jewish codices.

From all of this, therefore, the *Alexandrian canon* really *must be admitted*, also prescinding from the other arguments.

63. B. Among Christians. 1) *The Apostles* certainly approved and handed on to Christians the canon of the books of the O.T., which they often cite under the formula *it is written*. And although that cannot be said *directly* about the deuterocanonical books, since they never cite them under the formula *it is written*⁶; but there is no doubt that they *handed on* to Gentiles, who did not know Hebrew, and to the Hellenistic Jews, Alexandrian copies of Holy Scripture which contained the deuterocanonical books; on the other hand, for the most part the citations from the O.T. were made by the Apostles from the Alexandrian version.

But the Apostles were obligated to hand on and guard incorrupt the deposit of the faith, especially with regard to the sacred books, however they never gave a warning about the exclusion of the deuterocanonical books. And it is not right to say that the Apostles, as Palestinians, made the Palestinian canon their own; but that the reading of the LXX brought it about that all followed the Alexandrian canon: for, it is by no means certain

5. See *ibid.*, n.17f.

6. This non-citation does not suffice, clearly, in order to exclude these books; because neither are some of the other protocanonical books cited by them, but still there was no doubt about their inspiration.

that, at the time of the Apostles, the Palestinians acknowledged none of the deuterocanonical books (see above n.62); and it is not to be said that the Church learned from the Jews which were the sacred books, but from Christ the Lord himself and from the Apostles directly.

64. 2) Testimonies of the 2nd and 3rd centuries.⁷ During almost the first two centuries there were no doubts in the Church concerning the inspiration of the deuterocanonical books; rather, clearly they used them and in the *Roman* Church Pope St. Clement, Hermas and St. Hippolytus give testimony to them; in the *Gallican* Church St. Irenaeus; in the *West African* Church Tertullian and St. Cyprian; in the *oriental* Church St. Polycarp and St. Athenagoras. But if St. Justin takes only one or two testimonies from the deuterocanonical books, please note that he is arguing with Gentiles or with Tryphon, a Jew, whom he warns that he is instituting his argument “from those things that among you are commonly admitted.”⁸

In the *Alexandrian* Church, besides the testimonies from *Clement*, more abundant ones come from *Origen*, a very learned man, who not only uses the deuterocanonical books as inspired, but he also wrote the Hexapla and pointed out (see *On Revelation* n.204) “that when we argue with the Jews, we do not quote those things that are lacking in their books.”⁹ To these can be added St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Methodius, St. Dionysius of Alexandria.

The first indications of doubts come already from St. Melito of Sarda (+ before 195) and from Origen; the reasons seem to be in the fact that, since the Jews denied the authority of the deuterocanonical books, the Christians could not use them as arguments; hence, since doubts increased more and more, it came about that some did not dare to include those books, about whose inspiration there was a dispute, in the canon of inspired books. Thus Origen¹⁰ himself and St. Melito of Sarda¹¹ sometimes handed on an incomplete canon of the Old Testament.

65. 3) Testimonies of the 4th and 5th centuries.¹² In these centuries the Fathers without doubt recognize the deuterocanonical books, since they cite them under the formula of *it is written*, or to prove the dogmas; although they do hand on an incomplete catalogue. But no one *with certainty and always* denied the inspiration of the deuterocanonical books.

7. See *Instit. biblicae* 1^o 1.2 n.21-26.

8. *Adversus Tryphonem* 120: MG 6,756.

9. *Ad Africanum* 5: MG 11,60.

10. See *Comment. In Ps 1* (in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* 6,25; MG 20,580); *De oration* 14: MG 11,461 C; *περί αρχόν* 4,33: MG 11,407.

11. In Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* 4,26: MG 20,396f.

12. See *Instit. biblicae* 1^o 1.2 n.278-32.

The Protestants themselves concede that the opinion of the Fathers favors Catholic dogma; but they claim that those Fathers selected their arguments without diligence. But that is said falsely, since it is known that the Fathers had to act with great care in polemical matters. But regarding the apocryphal books, which are cited, only one or another Father held almost all of them as inspired; but several Fathers explicitly held that for a few of them, like 3 Esdras. But they were never held in all the Church with a universal consent.

St. Jerome, after the year 389, as his *private* opinion denied the inspiration of the deuterocanonical books; but he did acknowledge that the western Church favors this opinion.¹³

66. 4) *Testimonies of the Middle Ages*.¹⁴ In the Middle Ages in the Orient the doubts disappear. And in the West, until the 10th century no one, besides Junilius Africanus (about the year 550), rejected the integral canon promulgated at the *Council of Carthage IV* and by the Roman Pontiffs.

The ancient doubts and opinion of *St. Jerome* were not unknown, especially after the literary renaissance during the Carolingian Age; but this authority influenced only a few to depart from the right path. But the *Council of Florence* sanctioned the common doctrine. Hence the contrary opinion is surprising of *St. Anthony* (+ 1459)¹⁵ and *Cajetan* (+ 1534),¹⁶ who followed the opinion of *St. Jerome*.

67. 5) *From the 16th century to our times*.¹⁷ The pseudo-reformers of the 16th century, rejecting the authority of the Church, also departed from the faith concerning the canon of the Scriptures. *Carlostadius* (in 1520) followed the Palestinian canon.¹⁸ *Luther*, following his own subjective criterion, namely, by examining the books to see whether in them the doctrine on justification by faith in Jesus was preached, tended to exclude the deuterocanonical books (perhaps with the exception of 1 Macc.), but also *Esther*, *Chronicles*, *Ecclesiastes* from the protocanonical books; but in his German version (1534) he did translate the deuterocanonical books, but separated from the

13. Thus in the Preface to the books of Samuel: "This prologue of the Scriptures, as a general principle for all the books which we translate from Hebrew into Latin, can agree with this: that we may be able to know whatever is outside of these books, should be placed among the *apocryphal* writings": ML 28,600-602. See also *Praef. In Esdras*: ML 28,1472; *Praef. In libros Salomonis*: ML 28,1307f. Hence his living in Palestine had a great influence on *St. Jerome*, as it seems, and the fact that some of the books are not found in the Hebrew codices. However, he does write in his *Epist. ad Principiam* (in 396): "Ruth and Esther and Judith are of such glory that their names are included in the *sacred* volumes"; ML 22,623.

14. See *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.33f.

15. *Chron.* 1,3,5-9; *Summ. Theolog.* 3,18,6; see *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.34.

16. *In omnes libros Script. Comment.* 2 (Lyons 1639) 400; see *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.34.

17. See *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.35-38.

18. In his little book *De canonicis Scripturis*.

others and under the title of "apocrypha".

The Council of Trent at the very beginning (Feb. 8 to April 8, 1546) determined which are the canonical Scriptures, by receiving the canon of the Council of Florence, and there was no controversy about accepting the deuterocanonical books; rather and with an equal sense of piety the Fathers accepted all the books and there was no disagreement among them about their authority (D 1501f.).¹⁹

Therefore wrongly B. Lamy (+1715), and Io. Iahn (+ 1816), and A. Loisy (1890) have tried to distinguish in the sacred books various levels of authority.

Vatican Council I renewed the decree of Trent (D 3029).

Among *Protestants*, after rationalism, having rejected supernatural inspiration, the canon of the O.T. now only has the meaning of a certain fortuitous collection of national Hebrew literature.

Among the *Orthodox Greeks* the opinion of the old Protestants about not accepting the deuterocanonical books has prevailed.

On the canon of the New Testament²⁰

68. The process of the collection of the inspired books of the N.T. was completed in a short space of time for many of the books, since their divine origin was sufficiently established from the apostolic tradition, v.gr., regarding the four Gospels. Concerning the other books there were doubts in some churches, until at the end of the 4th century they disappeared in almost the whole Church. But there is nothing surprising in the fact that writings of the N.T., which had been directed to particular churches, were not immediately included everywhere in the complete collection.

There are beginnings of the collections of this kind regarding the Letters of St. Paul in what St. Peter says in 2 Pet. 3:15f. Regarding the *Gospel of Luke*, which was held as inspired, this was probably deduced from 1 Tim. 5:18 where there is an equal citation of Deut. 25:4 and Luke 10:7 under the formula *Scripture says*.

69. 1) Testimonies of the 1st and 2nd centuries. In these centuries the books considered to be inspired are not to be collected from an explicit catalogue, but implicitly from the citations of the authors; and this is so,

19. See R. Criado, S.J., *El Concilio de Trento y los estudios biblicos* 131 (1945) 153-172. On the deuterocanonical books in the Council of Trent see also P.G. Duncker, O.P., *De singulis S. Scripturae libris controversiis in Concilio Tridentino*: Studia Anselmiana 27-28 (Rome 1951) 66-93.

20. Besides the authors mentioned above in the bibliography for the whole article, see M.-J. Lagrange, *Histoire ancienne du canon du Nouveau Testament* (Paris 1933); and from the non-Catholics, Theodore Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* 2 vol. (Erlangen 1888-1890); and by the same author, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* 10 vol. from the year 1881.

although the name of the sacred author is not mentioned or the words do not agree perfectly with the sacred text (thus v.gr., in St. Irenaeus, who certainly used the writings of the N.T. For these authors narrated things from memory rather than copying them down from a book.²¹

From the writings of St. Clement, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp... and the Apostolic Fathers at the end of the 1st century and the beginning of the 2nd century, it is certain that almost all of the writings of the N.T. existed, and *they were held in the greatest reverence*.²²

In fact *there are explicit testimonies about inspiration*. St. Clement of Rome says that St. Paul πνευματικῶς wrote the Letter to the Corinthians²³; the *Letter of Barnabas* cites Matt. 22:14 under the formula *as it is written*²⁴; St. Ignatius several times equates the Gospels to the Law and the Prophets.²⁵ Often the N.T. is cited under the formula *as it is written*; and this ought not to seem surprising according to the custom of the time.

After the middle of the 2nd century: St. Justin knew *the commentary of the Apostles, which are called the Gospels*, which doubtless are our four Gospels from which his disciple Tatian wrote the Diatessaron; and he says that in the meetings of Christians *the commentaries of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets were read*,²⁶ and so equating those writings with these sacred books. He also knew the book of Revelation which St. John prophesied²⁷; and he knew all the Letters, except Philemon, 2 and 3 John and Jude. St. Theophilus of Antioch also knew some books as *inspired*, as he expressly states.

70. The heretics themselves cited some books of the N.T. as scriptures.

Marcion rejected the O.T.; and, according to the accusation of Catholics, of the four Gospel he accepted only Luke; but of the Letters of St. Paul he selected ten. By the appearance of Marcion and of the Gnostic heresies it can be said that more care was taken in determining the canon explicitly; but the canon did already exist, although implicitly; Marcion was not the first to try to determine it; and it could not happen that the Church herself would receive those books in the canon, which were approved by the heretics, if she had not already approved them.

For, St. Irenaeus refers to almost all the books of the N.T. as inspired,

21. But one should distinguish these less exact citations from the Agrapha, for example in Acts 20:35, which were known through oral tradition.

22. See Funk, *Patres apostolici* 1, at the final index of the quotes from Holy Scripture.

23. *Epist. ad Cor* 47,3: Funk 1,160.

24. *Epist. Barnabae* 4,14: Funk 1,48.

25. *Ad Smyrnaeos* 7,2; *Ad Philadel.* 8f.: Funk 1,282.270.272.

26. *Apolog.* 1,67: R 129.

27. *Contra Tryphonem* 81: MG 6,669.

appealing to the tradition of the Apostles. Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian appeal in the same way to the tradition... Therefore Marcion constructed his own canon from the canon already existing in the Church.

71. 2) Testimonies from the end of the 2nd century to the 4th century. At this time clear testimonies are found in all the major churches. The canon in the *Muratorian Fragment* (before the year 180) recounts the Gospels, Acts, the Letters of Paul (except Heb.), Rev., 1 and 2 John and Jude among the sacred books *read publicly* in church.²⁸

In Gaul St. Irenaeus, in Africa Tertullian and St. Cyprian bear witness also to several books.

At Alexandria the canon of the N.T is found complete. Clement of Alexandria, according to the words of Eusebius of Caesarea "in the books *Hypotyposeon*, presented a lengthy account of all... of the Scriptures of both Testaments, lest there be any doubt about the ones omitted."²⁹ Origen held that all the books of the N.T are inspired, listing also all the Catholic Epistles with the other writings of the N.T.³⁰; hence he rejected the doubts he knew about.

Eusebius (+ 340) distinguishes the canonical books accepted by all from those about which there was controversy (James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John), which "however by many are thought to be genuine"; concerning the book of Revelation he remains doubtful whether it should be placed among the spurious books or among the canonical.³¹

Regarding the *apocryphal books*, some (like the *Shepherd Hermas*) were considered to be inspired by some authors and also in some particular churches for a certain length of time; but not in the whole Church, and after the 4th century by almost no one.

72. 3) From the 4th century to our times. Until the 6th century: In the West, because of increased contact with the Orient, the Letters to the Hebrews, 2 Peter and Jude, which before the 4th century seem to have been unknown, became known and were admitted to the canon; and 2 and 3 John, which were rarely cited, probably because of their brevity, are more distinctly included in the catalogues. In the Orient the different churches should be distinguished according to the way in which the deuterocanonical books were admitted.³²

In the Middle Ages: several Greek authors repeat the ancient canons, and therefore omit Revelation. "But the Latin authors, who had doubts especially about the smaller Catholic Epistles, drew those doubts from the works of St.

28. R 268.

29. *Hist. Eccles.* 6,14: MG 20,549.

30. *In Iesu Nave homil.* 7,1: R 538.

31. *Hist. eccles.* 3,25: MG 20,268-272.

32. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.59.

Jerome; however no one because of this ejected any New Testament writing from the canon or said that it has less authority...."³³

The opinion of Cajetan is astonishing; having badly interpreted St. Jerome (as if he had made his own the doubts he mentioned), he taught that the Letters Hebrews, James, 2 and 3 John and Jude, are doubtful regarding their authors and are of less authority, so that with these "it could not be determined, if any doubt concerning the faith were present." Similarly regarding Mark 16:9-20 (although Cajetan held it to be genuine), he said that there is no "solid authority to strengthen faith, like the other parts of Mark which are not doubtful."³⁴

73. *At the time of the Council of Trent.*³⁵ The first reformers, using false criteria mentioned above in n.45, did not agree among themselves about the canon of the N.T.

Among Catholics, for literary reasons, Erasmus being the leader, doubts were raised about some books and pericopes, which were lacking in some of the codices. But the Council of Trent, when doubts were raised about Hebrew, James, 2 John and Revelation, and especially about the pericopes in the Gospels about which there was some controversy, said that all the books listed in its decree, with all their parts, must be accepted as sacred and canonical (D 1501-1505; EB 60 [45]).

74. *After the Council of Trent.*³⁶ Among the Protestants J.S. Semler (+ 1791), and J.D. Michaelis (1791) again raised the pristine doubts about some books. But, after the appearance of rationalism, there was a tendency to deny the authenticity of the books of the N.T. and to locate their origin at the end of the 2nd century. Thus among these Protestants the canon is a name with no reality corresponding to it, and is on the same level with "primitive Christian literature."

Among Catholics now there are no controversies about the extent of the canon; and Vatican I renewed the decree of Trent (D 3006; EB 77 [62]). Only in recent time there has been a dispute about the authenticity of the author of some books (Hebrews and 2 Peter) or of a part, for example, concerning the account of the adulteress (John 7:53—8:11)—whether John is the author of it.

33. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.60.

34. *Ibid.*

35. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.61-63.

36. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.2 n.64.

ARTICLE IV

ON THE NATURE OF INSPIRATION

Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁴, thesis on the divine Scriptures 3f. p.316-343; Pesch, *De inspiratione* 1.2 c.2; Bea, *De inspiratione* n.33-65; Höpfl-Gut, *Introductio generalis* n.59-93; Tromp, *De inspiratione*⁵ second section; E. Mangelot, *Inspiration de l'Écriture*: DTC 7,2098-2177; A. Durand, *Inspiration de la Bible*: DAFC 2,897-906; H. Lussseau, *Essai sur la nature de l'inspiration scripturaire* (Paris 1930).

75. After the fact of revelation has been established, that is, that God is the author of the sacred books, and it is known which books really are inspired (art. I-III), now the nature of inspiration is to be studied more carefully.

But regarding inspiration, the most important point concerns *how it is received in man*; since concerning inspiration as it is in God, the same thing holds true which we can say about the nature of God's actions outside of himself (see *On Revelation* n.48).

76. *Inspiration is an extraordinary charism.* a) *It is surely a charism*: certainly it is a *supernatural gift* of grace [which therefore no one can require or merit] pertaining to the order of *freely given grace* (*gratia gratis data*), namely, which is given primarily for the good of the community.

b) And also it is an *extraordinary* charism: 1) because it is not a permanent habit, but only a passing act; for it is not *given always*, as is certain from history. 2) *It also requires a special motion from God*; for with the natural concurrence alone of God or with the ordinary assistance of graces the human author would remain the principal author of the book nor would God be the author by antonomasia.

c) This charism *is reduced to a prophetic gift*; since God speaks to men through prophets. The difference from prophecy is had on the part of the result (writing, not speaking); and also in order to prophesy in the strict sense, that is, to speak in the name of God, *revelation* is required; but for inspiration that is not required, as will be made clear by what is said below.

77. We will proceed in such a way that first we will reject the false explanations about the nature of inspiration, which *sin through defect*; then we will propose *the true explanation about it and about its constitutive parts*; from this finally will appear the falsity of those explanations that *sin through excess*, that is, those that require ecstasy or revelation or awareness of inspiration.

FALSE EXPLANATIONS BY DEFECT

Thesis 3. The inspiration of the sacred books is not to be explained by their subsequent approbation (I), "nor merely because they contain no admixture of error" (II).

First part

78. The adversaries are the defenders of the system of *subsequent approbation*:

Leonard Lessius, S.J. (1554-1623), a professor at Louvain, admitted the *possibility* (not the fact) that a book *written by human industry*, may become Holy Scripture, if the Holy Spirit afterwards publicly bears witness that there is nothing false in it; he understands it, however, if the book is written *because of divine instigation*.

Here are his words: "... if some pious and salutary work, composed by human industry because of divine instigation, would be approved by the public testimony of the Holy Spirit as true in all its parts; such a work would have the authority equally infallible as Holy Scripture, and rightly would be called Holy Scripture and the word of God. For, a letter dictated by a king and one merely signed by him have the same authority. This method, although *de facto* I think it is not found in any book of canonical Scripture, nevertheless is not impossible."¹

James Bonfrere, S.J. (1573-1642), professor at Douai in Belgium, taught that the Holy Spirit could be thought of in three ways as relating himself to the Holy Scriptures "namely, antecedently, concomitantly, and subsequently; all of these three ways seem to suffice so that something may be Holy Scripture and the word of God." But later he explains what he understands by the subsequent way: "The Holy Spirit could approve it *subsequently*, if something were written by an author on his own initiative without the help, direction or assistance of the Holy Spirit, but afterwards the Holy Spirit would bear witness that everything written in it is true... Although I do not think that the Holy Spirit at any time used this third way for the books that we have in Holy Scripture, nevertheless absolutely nothing prevents him from using it, or that sometime he will use it..."² Therefore he is touching on the question of right or of possibility, not on a question of fact.

1. In G. Schneemann, S.J., *Controversiarum de divinae gratiae liberique arbitrii concordia initia et progressus* (Friburg Br. 1881) 466f. More information on this matter concerning the mind of Lessius and the way of interpreting him was published and disputed by J. Kleutgen, *ibid.*, 469-473.478ff. See also CL 7,140f.; and more recently S. Pagano, O.M.I., *Evolution de la troisième proposition de Lessius sur l'inspiration dans la controverse de Louvain* (1587-1588): *Rev.Univer. d'Ottawa* 22 (1952) 129*-150*; J. de Fraine, S.J., *Lessius' Leer over de Inspiratie der h. Schrift*: *Bijdragen* 15 (1954) 256-271.
2. *In totam Scripturam Sacram praeloquia* c.8 s.1,7: Migne, *Cursus Scripturae* 1,109.114.

Daniel Haneberg (+ 1876), a professor in Munich towards the middle of the 19th century, says something different: he touches on the question of fact, and said that subsequent approbation suffices for inspiration regarding relations or empirical-historical books; thus the Church approved them by accepting them in the canon.³ That was rejected at Vatican I, and afterwards he retracted his opinion.⁴

79. The doctrine of the Church opposed to this theory is found expressly in *Vatican Council I* (D 3006), since the Council requires for inspiration the positive influx of God inspiring and making the book, and says that the mere approbation of the *Church* does not suffice. But the declaration does not bear directly on the teaching of Lessius and of Bonfrere, touching on the question of right⁵ and speaking about the approval of the Holy Spirit; nevertheless as a result the teaching of Lessius and Bonfrere cannot be sustained.

The theological note of the thesis is easily deduced from this declaration of the Council as *Catholic doctrine*; for the words of the Vatican Council are directed immediately to the approval of the *Church*, but the words of our thesis have a more general meaning.

80. Proof. Subsequent approbation alone does not bring it about that someone is the author simply or the writer of a book; just as if a Bishop approves a book, he is not therefore its author. Hence God would not then be the author or the writer of the sacred books; the books of course would have divine authority, but not a divine origin.

81. You will say 1): An Encyclical or pastoral letters written by a theologian, or a document written by a secretary, become respectively the word of the Pontiff or of the Bishop or of the King after their subsequent approbation, and all consider it as such and say that it is such.

Response. Please note that such documents become the word of the Pope or of a Bishop or of a King insofar as they assume pontifical or episcopal or royal *authority, but not by reason of their composition*, which is the matter in question; for this it is required that the documents be written at the request of the Pope, of the Bishop or of the King *and with full*

3. *Versuch einer Geschichte der biblischen Offenbarung* (Regensburg 1850) 714; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.326; Bea, n.17 p.20.

4. In the fourth edition of the same work (1876); see Pesch, *ibid.*; Bea, *ibid.*

5. See the words of Bishop Gasser, Secretary at Vatican Council I: CL 7,140f., on the teaching of Lessius and others at Louvain.

dependence on their direction.

You will say 2): Also that purely human words, the statements of Aratus and Epimenidis (Acts 17:28: *for we are indeed his offspring*; Tit. 1:12: *Cretans are always liars*), have become the words of God through the subsequent approbation of God, which is made by the hagiographers. *Response.* Those words after the approval of the hagiographers have become the words of God *by way of a citation* and as a citation; but *they remain the words of men*. After the approval they are certainly infallibly true and God bears witness to that; but they were not therefore spoken by God (see n.106,4; 123f.).

Second part

82. The adversaries are the defenders of the system of *mere assistance*.

Iohannis Jahn, a professor at Vienna (+ 1816), taught that inspiration consists in divine assistance whereby errors in writing are prevented (*concomitant inspiration*); therefore also the word “inspiration,” since it signifies a positive influx, does not indicate well this merely negative function in this divine assistance.⁶

Richard Simon (1638-1712) placed inspiration in the “direction” of the Holy Spirit, lest the sacred authors fall into error. But he does not explain clearly the nature of that direction.⁷

83. Doctrine of the Church. The words of the thesis are taken from Vatican Council I (D 3006), where the teaching of Io. Jahn is rejected, while the reason is given why the Church considers her books sacred and canonical.

The theological note of the thesis consists in this—that it is *at least Catholic doctrine*; I say at least, because we can easily recognize the explicit definition of the Church in the words of the thesis (causal negative proposition).

84. Proof. No one only by correcting errors, like a censor, or merely by preventing errors from a book, while another person writes it, is the author of that book. Therefore God, if he did only that, would not therefore be the author of the sacred books nor would Scripture be the word of God.

God, by merely assisting the hagiographer lest he err, would be acting

6. *Einleitung in die göttliche Bücher* 1 (Vienna 1802) § 19 and 23; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.325.

7. *Histoire critique du texte du Nouveau Testament* (Rotterdam 1689) c.23ff.; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.17ff.

as he does in the infallibility of the Church, when she decides to make a dogmatic definition; but then *God is not the author of the definition, but the Church is*, and these definitions of the Councils and of the Roman Pontiffs have never been considered to be *inspired* or to have God as their author.

ON THE CONSTITUTIVE ELEMENTS OF INSPIRATION

Thesis 4. Inspiration in the hagiographers consists: a) in the supernatural enlightenment of the intellect to correctly conceive the ideas and the essential nature of the book; b) in the movement of the will to write all those things and only those things which God wills to be written; c) in divine assistance to carry out the work fittingly.

85. Just as previously, by proceeding in a negative way, we rejected false opinions through defect concerning the nature of inspiration, so now, *in a positive way*, we want to see in what inspiration consists of, as it is received in a man. But we are not asking how inspiration can come to be, but *how de facto* it is from the sources of revelation.

We will not proceed with a purely philosophical method from the analysis alone of the concept of an *author* in the abstract, or of an *instrument*, or from a mere analogy of a principal and instrumental cause; nor merely in a purely empirical way from an examination alone of the sacred text (which would not be sufficient); but *in a complex or combining way* from the documents known through revelation and from the certain data of philosophy.

86. The adversaries logically are the defenders of the false systems which we mentioned in the previous thesis.

87. Doctrine of the Church. Leo XIII in the *Letter "Providentissimus"* expressed our teaching in this way: "[The Holy Spirit] by supernatural power so moved and impelled them [the hagiographers] to write—he was so present to them—that the things which he ordered, and those only, they, first, rightly understood, then willed faithfully to write down, and finally expressed in apt words and with infallible truth: [and the reason is added] otherwise, it could not be said that he was the Author of the entire Scripture" (D 3293; EB 125 [110]).

Similarly Benedict XV in the *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"*: "If we

ask how we are to explain this power and action of God, the principal cause, on the sacred writers we shall find that St. Jerome in no wise differs from the *common teaching* of the Catholic Church. For he holds that *God, through his grace, illumines the writer's mind regarding the particular truth which, "in the person of God," he is to set before men; he holds, moreover, that God moves the writer's will—nay, even impels it, to write; finally, that God abides with him unceasingly in unique fashion, until his task is accomplished*" (EB 448 [461]).

88. The theological note of the thesis is established from what has preceded: the thesis is *not only common and certain, but also to be held with internal religious assent*, as a teaching imposed by the Pontiff. "And we will not be silent," Leo XIII said to the Minister General of the O.F.M.s. "What the Church thinks, what she wills concerning this matter [i.e., concerning the sane and prudent judgment which the sacred writings demand from those who study them] we have taught with great care through the Encyclical '*Providentissimus Deus*.' It is not permitted to any Catholic to neglect the precepts and documents of the Sovereign Pontiff" (EB¹ 128).⁸

Furthermore, since this doctrine is taught in the whole Catholic Church, but is not defined, with Benedict XV (above n.87) it can be said to be *Catholic doctrine*.

89. Proof. From the data given through revelation we know that God is the principal author of a sacred book, and a man is also the author, but as an instrument (of course rational) in the supernatural action of God.

Now that someone can be the author of a book it is necessary a) *that he rightly conceives the ideas to be written and the essential nature of the book*; b) *that he wills to write it*; c) *that de facto he rightly accomplishes the work*.

Therefore, for the concept of God as an author to be verified, it is necessary that God, out of the infinite treasury of his own ideas, *determines the ideas* to be written and the essential nature of the book, and at the same time *wills and carries out* the writing itself of those ideas in an essentially stable form. Also, in order for the concept of man as a rational author to be verified in writing the book, it is necessary that *he conceives the ideas and the essential nature of the book, wants to write it, and actually accomplishes the work*.

Now these actions of God as the principal cause, and the actions of man as the instrumental cause, work together in producing the same book blessed with a supernatural gift. Therefore it is necessary that God, by his supernatural and positive influence, *subordinates to himself, elevates and*

8. The same teaching is found in the Encyclical on following the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. It is also in his letter to the Bishops of France: EB¹ 129.

applies all those faculties of the hagiographer necessary for the writing of the book. For this is what belongs to a principal cause with respect to the instrumental cause.

Therefore God through inspiration by his supernatural power must a) illumine the intellect of the hagiographer to rightly conceive all the things he wants to be written, that is, to rightly conceive the ideas and essential nature of the book (without which a book does not exist); b) he must impel and move the will to write all and only the things which he commands; c) and he must assist so that *de facto* all of them are expressed aptly with infallible truth.

Thus God and man must work together at those things that pertain to producing a book. Then, as we know, *the whole effect is from the principal cause, and the whole is from the instrumental cause*, but according to different formalities. Therefore the book is at the same time from God and divine, and from man and human; and from this variety of the used instrument, the differences in the form of the books can be explained.⁹

90. On the singular constitutive elements of inspiration we can undertake a further examination:

1) **The influence of God on the work of the intellect of the hagiographer¹⁰**

It is easy to confirm that the work of the intellect and its application are required in order to write a book. But there is also a question here: for which acts of the intellect is the supernatural illumination required?

Without doubt it is required *for the ideas or judgments of the book*, i.e., for the views or truths that are affirmed in it. For in any book this is a most important point.

Moreover, it is required *for those elements which constitute the essential or formal nature of the book*, namely, those elements without which the book is not such as the author intended; the other things would pertain

9. Bea argues about the various ways of proving the thesis in his *De inspiratione* n.36-39; also Durand, *Inspiration*: DAFC 2,897-899; etc. The essence of writing recently was treated by Fr. Crisostomo de Pamplona, O.D.M.Cap., *Algunas cuestiones relacionadas con la naturaleza del influjo inspirativo*: EstFranc 49 (1948) 36-55. On the origin and evolution of the idea of "instrumentality" there is a study by A. Bea, *Die Instrumentalitätsidee in der Inspirationslehre*: Studia Anselmiana 27-28 (Rome 1951) 47-65. G. Cuadrado also treats the theory of instrumentality, *La teoría de la instrumentalidad explica, facilita y garantiza el concepto de inspiración bíblica*: XIV Semana Bíblica Española (September 1953), Madrid 1954, p. 177-175; and Fr. Sebastián, C.M.F., *Interpretación teológica de la inspiración*: *ibid.*, p.177-186.

10. E.M. Esteve, O. Carm., recently wrote about this question, *Acción de la inspiración en el entendimiento*: EstBibl 5 (1946) 271-280. And on the mind of St. Augustine, R. Rábanos, C.M., *La función del entendimiento del hagiographo en la inspiración, según S.Agustín*: EstBibl 5 (1946) 73-93.

to the accidental or material nature of the book. Therefore the essential element is *the end which is intended* in the book and *the internal disposition of things in general*; accidentally, because of the end which is intended (v.gr., stylistic, aesthetic), the style or external form could pertain to the essentials.

91. *The influence on the theoretical or speculative judgments and on the practical judgments.* From what we have already said, it is certain that the hagiographer must conceive *the theoretical or speculative judgments* which God wants to be communicated to men, that is, what must be said and with what grade of certitude. Then there is the "illumination" or the supernatural enlightenment of the intellect, by which it is elevated, if that is necessary, to perceive divine things, if the man already does not know the things that must be said. But if he already knows naturally what must be said (v.gr., St. Luke gathering information by his own efforts before he wrote the Gospel), then by the divine light his intellect is strengthened "to judge according to the certitude of divine truth the things which can be known by human reason."¹¹

Moreover, to write a book the intellect must be determined by *practical judgments*: this should be written. But this determination must be internal and coming from God, so that he can produce these judgments in a man by his supernatural power; therefore a *purely* external determination by the activity of men is not sufficient. The influence of God on these judgments is thought to be *either immediate*, that is, by elevating the intellectual power itself, *or in a mediated way* by a theoretical judgment already elevated, but the influence is always *internal*.

92. *Whether illumination is sufficient for practical judgments.* Pesch,¹² Dorsch,¹³ and others say that the supernatural illumination is sufficient for practical judgments, without a preceding direct supernatural illumination for theoretical judgments; because—they say—in the performed act of a practical judgment illuminated by God, namely, when the hagiographer judges supernaturally about something to be written, a theoretical judgment about the truth of the matter to be written is included, and it is absolutely repugnant that God would give a supernatural illumination for such judgments, if false things were to be written; but on the other hand, the acceptance of things is not of the essence of inspiration (see n.94).

11. S.Th. II-II, q. 174, a. 2 ad 3.

12. *De inspiratione* n.148 p.425f.

13. *De inspiratione*² p.105-107.

Those who contradict this are Bea¹⁴ and many others, like L. Billot, M.I Lagrange, H. Lusseau, A. Merk, E. Mangenot..., and their opinion seems to be more probable. For, naturally theoretical judgments (on truth, the sublimity of ideas...) are previous and they determine psychologically the practical judgments (on the usefulness or necessity of what is to be written). Therefore also it is necessary that they be illuminated by God supernaturally. Also, otherwise the theoretical judgments, or ideas, which is what is most important in any book, would remain purely human judgments, even if afterwards they were implicitly *confirmed* by God in the practical judgments, but then they would not be divine judgments. And then, it seems, it would not be apparent clearly how God by his supernatural power would illuminate hagiographers to rightly *conceive in their mind* what he wants to be written.

93. Influence on the external form. Since a book does not exist without a definite external form, it is necessary that God move the hagiographer *to the choice of the external form and to the mental activity whereby the external form becomes a book*, so that in this way aptly and infallibly the ideas are expressed which God wants to be communicated. But preserving this aptitude, the determination of the individual literary elements can be left to the proper activity of the hagiographer (see n.128ff.).

S. Tromp distinguishes explicitly between speculative *critical* judgments and other *approving* judgments: by those theoretical judgments, which we explained in n.91, the concept of a book as to its reality is fulfilled; by the approving judgments, after the choice of the external expression, the conformity and the agreement between the internal concept and the external verbal expression is affirmed. Both judgments are supernatural and the author requires both for inspiration, as he proves.¹⁵

94. Corollaries. From what has been said we draw some conclusions concerning the nature of this influence of God on the intellect of the hagiographer:

a) *The acceptance of things from God in the mind of the hagiographer is not necessary* for biblical inspiration, otherwise than for revelation; for, God can remain the author of ideas which a man by his own efforts knew or investigated, provided that afterwards he supernaturally illumines his intellect in order to pass judgment on them.

Therefore, *for inspiration neither revelation nor the infusion of species*

14. *De inspiratione* n.49.

15. *De inspiratione*^s p.87f. And he also requires a supernatural *practical executive* judgment and a supernatural *practical approving* judgment: *ibid.*, p.89. See also p.104.

is required.

Thus in some inspired books the hagiographers *say they made use of research* in order to find their material or the truth (v.gr., Luke 1:1ff.; 2 Macc. 2:24-32) or *they say they are narrating what they themselves saw* (John 19:35; 1 John 1:1-3). Therefore the sacred authors could use other sources in order to write their book (see Prov. 30:1; 31:1), even profane; and we can investigate these sources. See on the sources of the Pentateuch, D 3396; on the sources of Mark and Luke, D 3575; on the sources of Acts, D 3585.

b) Because of this supernatural illumination in the mind of the hagiographer, *Scripture does not have errors and has a singular excellence* (v.gr., sobriety, sublimity of teaching...); and also sublime things are said by authors lacking literary formation or culture. Also the sacred authors in an extraordinary way rightly judge and separate what is true from what is false in the philosophical systems (v.gr., the *logos* in St. John) or religious systems (v.gr., the “mysteries” in St. Paul).

In virtue of this divine influence *Scripture has a fuller sense*, which the hagiographer explicitly and clearly understood and intended—a sense to be determined not just by the literary criteria of hermeneutics (see on the fuller sense [*sensus plenior*] n.218-220).

2) The influence of God on the will of the hagiographer

95. It is indeed required that God, the principal author, induce the hagiographer to write; for, the mere communication of ideas or coordination of judgments and thoughts through his influence on the intellect would not be sufficient: in that way God would be the author of the ideas, but not of a book; because, *for someone to be the author of a book it does not suffice to have ideas, but it is necessary that he wills to manifest them externally* and de facto he manifests them through a book.

Therefore there is in the hagiographer a true motion of the will from God. Concerning this motion it is certain from 2 Pet. 1:21: *No prophecy ever came by the impulse of men, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God.*

And this motion by its own force *is necessary not only to begin the work, but—since it is required de facto in order to write books—it is necessary in order to continue and finish the work.*

Moreover, this motion must be of such a nature that the hagiographer does not omit anything or add anything to the things God’s wishes to be communicated. If he omits something, then the whole divine thought is not contained in the book; if he adds something, then it is not God, but man

who is the author of the added part. Therefore the motion is *to communicate all those things and only those things that God wishes to be communicated*; therefore it is not a vague or general motion, but a definite one.

96. *On the way by which God moves.* So that God really can be called the principal cause, *his infallibly efficacious* motion to write surely is required, that is, one proceeding from the *absolute* will of God (which—as is known—does not necessarily take away man’s freedom). For, if it were a matter of a motion from the *ordinary* will of God, then God could be said to be the author of many or of all good things which actually take place; but here he is said to be the author by antonomasia.

That being the case, the motion of the will in the hagiographer can be conceived as *purely internal* (whether *by an immediate physical influence* on the will, or *by a mediated, moral, influence*, by the help of internal thinking); or it can be thought to be *external* and moral (through angels, prayers, the words of others...), that is, if God by his special providence directs these means so that the hagiographer is moved to write.

More probably it is said—so it seems—that *what is required is the positive and supernatural influence of God by a physical and immediate motion* on the will of the hagiographer; for thus it more openly and obviously satisfies the documents of the Church (above, n.87) which speak about the stirring up and movement of the will of the hagiographer by God in inspiration. However, a purely mediated or external influence, moving the will with the help of thinking, would not so clearly bring it about that the hagiographer would determine himself to write as an instrument of God, but it would seem to be determined by himself.¹⁶

97. Others,¹⁷ however, think that a mediated motion of God is sufficient, or an internal one or also through external means (commands, pressing things, prayers...), provided that God wills *absolutely* that this effect of the motion should be obtained, and if by such a means it were not obtained, he would be prepared to use another means until the effect of moving the will of the man were obtained. But, unless this absolute will of God were present, certainly it would not suffice that God should be called the author not even by giving the command to write; because such moral influence, merely external, does not take away the fact that the man remains the principal cause of the book.

But if as more probable we require that physical and immediate motion on the will, we are not therefore denying the external and moral influences which can be present, concerning which history bears witness (see v.gr., *On Revelation* n.279-282) or about which the sacred authors themselves speak (a command from God to write; v.gr., Jer. 30:2; 36:2...).

16. Thus Bea, *De inspiratione* n.61.

17. V.gr., Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, *Theolog. fund.* n.565.

98. *Whether ecstasy is required or freedom is hindered in inspiration.* The Montanists and Tertullian, and before them the Jew Philo, required being out of one's mind and alienation from one's senses, or ecstasy, for inspiration; however, *that this is not necessary is known from the words of the sacred authors*, since they speak about their own work in writing, or about the full possession of their faculties, or about the fruits of their labor (Luke 1:3; 2 Macc. 2:24-32; Rom. 15:15-17; 2 Cor. 7:8-12; 13:10...).

The Fathers also, writing against the Montanists, rejected this alienation and ecstasy.¹⁸

From the explanation given previously, concerning this motion of the will, it appears that the freedom is not necessarily impeded. And *de facto it was fitting and is fitting* that the prophets and hagiographers, *as rational instruments*, prophesy and write freely. Rightly, therefore, "mantic" inspiration, which was proper to the sibyls, etc., *generally and certainly is rejected* as not necessary.

But this motion of God for inspiration is thought of in different ways, like the motions of actual grace in the different theories; some, according to their opinion, think of it as physically determining pre-motions; but others look for its efficacy in an infallible connection of the motion of God with the effect to be obtained, which is known with the help of middle knowledge (*scientia media*).

3) The influence of God in the production of a book

99. The necessity of this influence is certain because *without the actual writing and production of the book no one is said to be an author*. With a merely preceding influence God would be the author of the judgments conceived by the hagiographer, but not as *written* by him.

This divine assistance is required lest the human activity omit or add something, or he expresses the divine meaning with inept words; because *a man, even being illuminated and moved in the beginning, can make mistakes and be deficient as a performing instrument*.

Therefore in the production of the book: a) *the psychological and physiological acting faculties of the hagiographer participate in the supernatural influence of God on the intellect and will of the hagiographer*, according as those faculties are subject to the motion of the will and are subordinated to psychological laws. Therefore it does not seem necessary to assert an influence really different from the preceding influence on the intellect and will, but the influence spontaneously overflowing from the preceding influence seems to be sufficient. This holds for one part.

18. V.gr., St. Jerome, *Prolog. in Isa*: ML 24,19; *Prolog. in Naum*: ML 25,1292; St. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 48,2ff.: MG 41,588. Also St. Justin, on him see H. Bacht, S.J., *Die Lehre des hl. Justinus Martyr von der prophetischen Inspiration*: Schol 26 (1951) 481-495.

b) But on the other hand, *God gives his assistance* lest the authors stray from the right way (*negative assistance*). The positive influence of God will be necessary, if the instrumental second causes do not function properly. But if they function properly, God is thought sufficiently to provide for the production of the book *by his absolute will* by which he wills the existence of such a book.

100. *If the hagiographer uses a secretary* for the external form of the book (v.gr., St. Paul in the Letter to the Hebrews), then inspiration affects also the intellectual acts of the secretary which contribute to the writing of the book. For, the terminal point is *the written book*, and so the inspiration affects everything that enters into the writing of the book. It is clear that this influence on the secretary is because of the primary author and it is dependent on him.¹⁹

But if the hagiographer uses an amanuensis (Jer. 36; Rom. 16:22), which he employs only for the material writing, it is not necessary to assert the need of special help from God for the actual writing; but the divine assistance given to the hagiographer suffices, according to which he can watch over the work of the amanuensis. And the physical writing of the book does not necessarily pertain to the author himself, nor for this matter is it necessary to invoke a special intervention of God (see also n.146, objection 2).

101. Scholium 1. *Whether the hagiographers were always aware of their inspiration.* From the way of conceiving the threefold divine influence for inspiration, which we have treated, it appears that this influence *is similar to the influence of actual grace*. But just as salutary grace is not ordinarily an immediate datum of consciousness, so the supernatural and extraordinary nature of the acts of inspiration does not seem necessary to fall under consciousness.

And from the way of speaking of the sacred authors *it is not evident that they were always aware of their own inspiration*, when they were writing.

And the revelation of the things to be said, prior to the writing, also is not necessarily conjoined with inspiration; nor was it necessary that concomitantly it was revealed to the hagiographer that he was writing under the divine motion. But since the inspiration of the sacred books is a fact pertaining to faith, it was certainly necessary that the teachers of the faith, the Apostles, at least afterwards knew this fact and made it known to us.

19. See Bea, *De inspiratone* n.59.

102. *You will say* 1) The action of God on the intellect of the hagiographer either gives new knowledge of the things which are received from God, or it gives certitude concerning things which are already known naturally. But in both cases there is an internal change in the subject. Therefore the action of God on the intellect of the hagiographer must be known by the hagiographer.

Response. If new knowledge of things is given, and *this is received by a revelation from God*, then certainly there is consciousness of this action of God speaking. But *if the hagiographer only judges by the divine light* and so acquires certitude about the things which he knows naturally, there is indeed an internal change in the subject now judging supernaturally and forming a supernatural judgment for himself, but it is not required that as such it is known by him.

2) *Objector insists.* If this act of the intellect of the hagiographer is such in inspiration, it is a supernatural act. But a supernatural act is different from a purely human act. Therefore it should be known by the hagiographer as supernatural.

I distinguish the minor. A supernatural act is different *ontologically* from a purely human act, *conceded*; it is different *psychologically*, that is, as it appears in consciousness, *I subdistinguish*: as it appears in a *mediated* consciousness and because of a later reflection on it, *I bypass that*; as it appears in *immediate* and concomitant consciousness, *again I subdistinguish*: and that act must necessarily be known as supernatural, *denied*; sometimes *it can* be known immediately as such, as it can be known in the mystical gifts, *conceded*.

3) According to St. Peter (2 Pet. 1:21) *no prophecy ever came by the impulse of man (and inspiration)*. Therefore by the will of God imposed by God on the hagiographer. Therefore the hagiographer must know such imposition of the divine will.

I distinguish the first consequent. Inspiration came by the divine will *imposed by God through force, denied*; imposed in the sense that he has *the positive will that the author should write, I subdistinguish*: so that this will of God regarding the writing *must* necessarily be known immediately by the hagiographer, *denied*; so that *it could* be known like other actions of God and of his grace in us, *conceded*.

103. Scholium 2. *How inspiration and revelation are different.*²⁰ Revelation is the *speaking of God*; inspiration is *the action of God acting principally in the writing of a book*. In revelation there is *consciousness of the fact that God is speaking*; in inspiration such consciousness is not necessarily given.

But inspiration takes place to manifest what God wants to communicate to us; therefore through inspiration the sacred books contain the words of

20. See before, *De revelatione* n.58; but now more briefly.

God and the thoughts of God. *These thoughts will be objectively a divine revelation, mediated for us*, if that is made known to us—as it really is made known—by a divine ambassador (Jesus Christ, the Apostles), who receives the immediate revelation, that God wrote for us those words and their thoughts.

104. Scholium 3. *The relation between inspiration and definitions of the Church.* In the definitions of the Church, the Church herself is their author; in inspiration God is the author of the books. In definitions the positive intervention of God is not required, if the matter proceeds well; in inspiration the positive influence of God is certainly required, at least on the intellect and on the will.

ARTICLE V

ON THE EXTENSION OF INSPIRATION

105. From what has gone before (see thesis 2) it is established that *all the sacred books, which the Magisterium of the Church has placed in the canon, are inspired* or have God for their author. However, the question can be raised whether the causal influence of God covers only matters of faith and morals, and not the other purely historical things and the thoughts mentioned in passing.

Thoughts mentioned in passing are those which are mentioned only *accidentally* and do not seem to be important; v.gr., 2 Tim. 4:13: that Paul left his cloak at Troas; or Tob. 11:4: the dog of Tobias went along behind them. Therefore thoughts like this are not *for themselves* or *per se* revealed or inspired, because they do not fall under the primary end intended in revelation, like those truths which pertain to our supernatural end or are directly connected with it.

Some authors, in order to reconcile Holy Scripture with physics and with the natural and historical sciences, have proposed a solution by saying that those historical matters or things said in passing or purely scientific are not inspired; but that is not correct, as we prove in the following thesis.

The extension of inspiration can be conceived not only in its *length*, regarding absolutely all thoughts, but also in its *profundity*, regarding the elements (words) in the individual sentences. Therefore, on the other hand the question can also be asked whether this inspiration is extended to the determination of the material words of Scripture; or in what sense it includes the words and the material part of Scripture.

Thesis 5. The inspiration of the sacred books is extended to all the statements of the hagiographer, even to things mentioned in passing.

Pesch, n.272-276, 332-345, 431-435; Van Laak, *De inspiratione*² n.398-576; Dorsch, *De inspiratione*² c.4 a.1f.; Bea, n.65f.; Höpfl-Gut, n.94-106; Tromp⁵, prop.2; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, n.570-578; Mangenot, *Inspiration de l'Écriture*: DTC 7,2177-2192.

106. State of the question. 1) We are speaking about the *original* statements of the hagiographer; something else will have to be said about the apographa and the versions (n.147ff.); in these inspiration is present *equivalently*, inasmuch as they faithfully state the meaning of the original sentence. But in these versions some fully accidental errors could have crept in, v.gr., regarding numbers and chronology..., but not errors concerning

faith and morals in the versions approved by the Church; because the Magisterium of the Church is the custodian of these books. Therefore we are speaking about the *original* text.

2) We are considering inspiration *as it is now de facto*, known from the sources of revelation, but not as it could be conceived absolutely.

3) We are not saying that everything in the sacred books has the same importance by reason of the matter, but *that everything is equally divine by reason of the origin*. For, nothing prevents us from distinguishing between things revealed because of themselves, that is, because of the primary end which God intends (matters of faith and morals), and the things revealed because of something else, namely, because of their connection with other things: similarly, the thoughts of Scripture *are inspired because of themselves and because of something else*; but all are inspired.

4) If some sentence is borrowed from a profane author (v.gr., Acts 17:28; Tit. 1:12), then we are saying that what is inspired is not precisely this sentence as it comes from the profane author, but *that it is a citation and statement made by the hagiographer*. For, although all things that are in Scripture are the word of God *by reason of their authenticity*, not everything is so *by reason of the stated matter*; because not all the matters are said to be drawn from the divine source, like those that come from the other cited profane sources, known by the diligence and thinking of the hagiographer (see n.81,2; 123f.).

107. Adversaries. *The Gnostics and Manicheans* denied divine inspiration *for the Old Testament*. Thus in the *Acta disputationis S. Archelai* (before 350) the Manichean doctrine is presented: "...and the things that were written in the prophets and the law, nevertheless must be attributed to him [Satan]; for it is he who spoke then in the prophets, suggesting many false things to them about God, and temptations and concupiscences...."¹

The Anomoei restricted the inspiration of the sacred books, so that they do not admit some: "And since they began to be driven by the force of reason and to fall into error, they flee immediately and spring forth; and they say that the *Apostle said those things as a man*. And at another time: *Why do you bother me with the Old Testament?*"²

Similarly, there are others who object to the letters of St. Paul and other sacred books; they say that not all of them were written at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, but some of them only as a result of human prudence and

1. *Acta disputationis S. Archelai cum Manete heresiarcha* 13,71; MG 10,1452. There are other texts in A. Bea, *Deus auctor Scripturae...*: Ang 20 (1943) 28-31.

2. St. Epiphanius, *Adversus haereses* 76,6; MG 42,637.

reason. Accordingly they made little of the whole letter to Philemon as a letter written in a purely human manner.³

108. Erasmus (1466-1538) wrote that it is not to be feared if some slight error is found in Scripture, especially if the evangelists quote the O.T. from memory.⁴ Thus we conclude that Scripture—according to him—is not inspired in all its parts.

Henry Holden (1596-1662), a professor at the Sorbonne, said that the special help of inspiration extends both to purely doctrinal elements and to those things that have a proximate or necessary relation to the purely doctrinal elements; and in other matters that a certain common assistance is present for the pious writers.⁵

Philip Christmann (18th century) adopted a similar opinion.⁶

A. Rohling (19th century) said that only matters of faith and morals are inspired⁷; and Francis Lenormant (+ 1883) restricted inspiration to supernatural doctrines.⁸

109. J.H. Newman, Cardinal (+ 1890), excepted from inspiration the statements in passing (*obiter dicta*), that is, matters of pure fact and of less importance which do not seem to be connected with matters of faith and morals, v.gr., 2 Tim. 4:13; Judith 1:5; Tob. 11:9.⁹

S. di Bartolo restricted full inspiration to matters of faith and morals¹⁰; I. Semeria¹¹ and P. Savi¹² restricted it to the things that pertain to the end of Scripture. Loisy did not extend it to all of Holy Scripture in order to protect all of its parts from all error.¹³

Mons. D'Hulst, Rector of the Catholic Institute in Paris, referred to the opinion of Cardinal Newman as one that could be sustained, but he did

3. See St. Jerome, *In Mich* 5,2: ML 25,1255; *Praefatio in Philem.*: ML 26,637; St. Augustine, *Contra adversarium Legis et Prophetarum* 1,2,2: ML 42,638f.; Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei* 1.1 c.6 n.16.

4. In c.2 and 27 Matt.; see Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei* 1.1 c.6 n.17-21.

5. *Divinae fidei analysis* (Paris 1652) 1.1 c.5 sec.1 p.80; see DTC 7,2184; Pesch, n.315f.

6. *Regula fidei catholicae* (1792); see DTC 7,2185-2187; Pesch, n.320-322.

7. *Die Inspiration der Bibel und ihre Bedeutung für die freie Forschung*, in "Natur und Offenbarung" (Münster 1872) 92ff.; see DTC 7,2187. After a refutation by Franzelin (*De Traditione et Scriptura*⁴ p.520-537) he retracted his opinion.

8. *Les origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible et les traditions des peuples orientaux*² (Paris 1880); see DTC 7,2187; Pesch, n.338-340.

9. *On the Inspiration of Scripture: The nineteenth Century* 84 (1884) 185-190. See Pesch, n.336f.; J. Duggan, *Num sententia Cardinalis Newman de inerrantia sacrae Scripturae defendi possit?*: VerDom 18 (1938) 219-224.

10. *I criteri teologici* (French version, Paris 1886) 243-258; see DTC 7,2188; Pesch, n.333-335.

11. RevBibl 2 (1893) 434ff.; see Höpfl-Gut, n.98.

12. Science catholique 7 (1892ff.) 289-301; see Höpfl-Gut, 98.

13. D 3411; see also DTC 7,2191-s.

not adopt it for himself; after the *Encyclical "Providentissimus Deus"* he submitted himself totally to the Church.¹⁴

Some orthodox Protestants, like Gore, Sanday, hold that the inspired author was surely filled with the Holy Spirit, but in the writing of the book he necessarily also included his own fallible human elements¹⁵; therefore inspiration does not cover everything. But the divine elements are discerned with the help of the Holy Spirit.

110. Doctrine of the Church. *The Council of Trent*, wishing especially to protect the pericopes that were attacked by the reformers (like Mark 16:9-20; John 7:53—8:11; Luke 22:43),¹⁶ defined that all the books must be accepted as sacred and canonical, which just before they had enumerated, "all these books in their entirety, with all their parts, as they are being read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the ancient Latin vulgate editions" (D 1504). Hence, by preserving the natural sense of the word "part" or *in virtue of the word*, from the words of the Council the opinion proposed by Holden is rejected, namely, that inspiration is restricted to the purely doctrinal elements and that only religious matters are to be admitted necessarily as parts of the sacred books; because, beyond the religious matters, there are also profane things and many of them are read in Holy Scripture, like the catalogue of the sons of Israel and their wandering in the wilderness (Num. 26 and 33), and other genealogies. In this opinion also the sense of a *whole* book is not preserved.

But a doubt still remains as to whether these words of the Council refer to the matters in passing (*obiter dicta*), from the end which the Council formally intended, namely, of defending some pericopes or *parts*, which it seems must be understood not as transitory and profane statements, but according to the meaning proposed in the Council and according to moral estimation; that is, the Council was dealing with the *parts* under a different perspective or formal object, and therefore *it does not seem immediately to be helpful for our thesis*.¹⁷

111. Vatican Council I, adding nothing to the Tridentine definition regarding the extent of inspiration, and not touching on the meaning

14. Pesch, n.341-346. On the adversaries to this thesis and on the historical moment when the *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* appeared, see V. Larrañaga, S.J., *En el cincuentenario de la Enciclica "Providentissimus Deus"*: EstBibl 3 (1944) 3-24; *La crisis bíblica en el Instituto Católico de París (1881-1893)*: EstBibl 3 (1944) 173-188, 385-396.

15. See Tromp, *De inspiratione*² p.44.

16. See A. Theiner, *Acta genuina Concilii Tridentini* 1,72b; *Instit. biblicae* 1^o 1.2 n.63,3.

17. Bea, n.66. But a few authors, like L. Billot (*De inspiratione*² p.32f.) and S. Schiffini (*Divinitas Scripturarum* n.52), extend the words of the Council also to the "obiter dicta."

according to which the *parts of the books* in the Tridentine definition must be understood, defined (D 3029) that those parts must be believed to be inspired which Trent defined to be sacred and canonical.¹⁸ therefore it defined that inspiration extends to matters of faith and morals and to all the parts at least to those of most importance, which are in the canonical books.

Therefore from Trent and Vatican I probably the thesis is not defined in every way whatsoever, because it is not determined whether a *part* is also the minutest profane expression.

112. But Leo XIII, in the *Letter "Providentissimus,"* speaking indeed *about very small sentences*, said: "... it is absolutely wrong and forbidden either to narrow inspiration to certain parts only of Holy Scripture or to admit that the sacred author has erred. For the system of those who, in order to rid themselves of these difficulties, do not hesitate to concede that divine inspiration regards the things of faith and morals, and nothing beyond..." (D 3291; EB 124 [109]). Moreover, the will of Leo XIII is certain of requiring assent to those things which he taught in the *Letter "Providentissimus."*¹⁹

The following proposition of the Modernists has also been condemned: "Divine inspiration does not extend to the whole of sacred Scriptures in such a way that each and every one of its parts is protected from all error" (D 3411).

The teaching of Leo XIII about things mentioned in passing (*obiter dicta*) was proposed clearly *in the response of the Biblical Commission* (June 18, 1915): "all that the sacred author asserts, enunciates, and suggests must be held to be asserted, enunciated, and suggested by the Holy Spirit" (D 3629; EB 420 [433]). The same teaching is confirmed also by Benedict XV in the *Letter "Spiritus Paraclitus"* (D 3652; EB 454f. [467f.], and by Pius XII in the *Letter "Divino afflante Spiritu"* (EB 538).²⁰

113. Theological note. That inspiration extends to the parts at least of greater importance and, as it seems, to matters of faith and morals *was defined* at Vatican I (D 3029).

18. Franzelin: CL 7,1621b.

19. *Ad Ministrum Generalem O.F.M.*: EB¹ n.128; *Ad episcopos Galiae*: EB¹ 129; see above n.88. And Pius XII should be heard for what he said in the *Encyclical "Humani generis"*: "...Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in encyclical letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such letters the popes do not exercise the supreme power of their Teaching Authority... But if the supreme pontiffs in their official documents officially pass judgment on a matter up to that time under dispute, it is obvious that that matter, according to the mind and will of the pontiffs, cannot be any longer considered a question open to discussion among theologians" (D 3885).

20. See also on this matter EB 499 [512].

With regard to the “obiter dicta” there is not an express definition, but based on the preceding documents it is certain that it is *at least certain and Catholic doctrine*.

The authors agree on the absolute certitude of the thesis. *St. Thomas* holds this view from his teaching on the infallibility of Scripture; for he says: “A thing is of faith indirectly, if the denial of it involves as a consequence something against faith; as for instance if anyone said that Samuel is not the son of Elkanah, for it follows that the divine Scripture would be false.”²¹ *St. Robert Bellarmine* recounts among the heresies the opinions mentioned above of Erasmus and of those who thought that in the letters of *St. Paul* not everything was written at the guidance of the Holy Spirit (n.107).²² *Pesch* says “the teaching proposed above is certain, and this is especially to be held after the Encyclical of *Leo XIII*.”²³ *Dorsch* calls the contrary teaching a certain error in faith.²⁴ *Van Laak* says the same: “to deny that the individual sentences of Scripture are inspired is at least a certain error in faith.”²⁵ *Tromp* teaches that the teaching of the thesis is absolutely certain and must be held absolutely, so that the opposite view is an error in faith.²⁶

114. It is proved from Holy Scripture. To one considering *the way in which Christ and the Apostles cite Scripture*, under the formula *it is written, Scripture says* and similar expressions... (thus about 150 times in the whole N.T.²⁷), and that *they argue from this alone*, without making any distinction between important and minor things, religious and profane, and also by citing books of every kind—historical, prophetic, didactic..., while dealing both with Jews and with the instruction of the faithful (v.gr., Matt. 12:3; 1 Cor. 9:9; Gal. 3:16; 4:22; Heb. 12:27...): *then the conviction is clear that they consider absolutely everything as inspired and from God*.

This conviction is derived also from 2 Tim. 3:16 where, if “all scripture” is taken in a distributive way, that is, *whatever falls under the name of Scripture* (which more probably is meant, since *πάσα γραφή* does not have the article), but not if it is understood in a collective way: the whole collection taken in a complex way; *then it is asserted for the individual parts of Scripture that they are divinely inspired*.

Likewise for Rom. 15:4: *Whatever was written, was written for our*

21. I, q. 32, a. 4 c. In *Quodlib. 12* q.17 a.26 ad 1: “But this is to be held that whatever is contained in Holy Scripture is true; and whoever disagrees with this is a heretic.” And in *De potent. Q.4* a.1 c. he says this: “There cannot be an error in the divine Scripture handed on by the Holy Spirit, just as there can be no error in the faith which is taught by it.”

22. *De verbo Dei* l.1 c.6 n.16f.

23. *De inspiratione* n.435.

24. *De inspiratione*² p.148.

25. *De inspiratione* n.398.

26. *De inspiratione*³ p.38f.

27. *Pesch*, n.383; see *ibid.*, n.433.

instruction....

115. It is proved from tradition. The argument becomes more effective *from the consensus of the Fathers*, who propose this matter as witnesses of tradition:

On this point Leo XIII says: "And so emphatically were all the Fathers and Doctors agreed that the divine writings, as left by the hagiographers, are free from all error that they labored earnestly..., with no less skill than reverence, to reconcile with each other those numerous passages that seem at variance, for they were unanimous in laying it down that those writings in their entirety and in all their parts were equally of divine inspiration and that God himself, speaking through the sacred writers, could not set down anything but what was true" (*"Providentissimus"*: D 3293; EB 127 [112]).

Thus the Fathers teach that in Scripture a) *there is no error* and no contradiction can be found; b) nothing in it is *useless*; c) *even in the "obiter dicta" they are looking for the mystical meanings.*

So the Fathers *against Celsus, Porphyry and Julianus*, who objected that there is a disagreement in Scripture with history or science, do not respond by granting that the profane things are not inspired, but they show that the disagreement is only apparent or that Scripture has been falsely understood.

116. The words have universal validity which St. Augustine wrote to *St. Jerome*: "For, I admit to your Charity that it is from those books alone of the Scriptures, which are now called canonical, that I have learned to pay them such honor and respect as to believe most firmly that not one of their authors has erred in writing anything at all. If I do find anything in those books which seems contrary to truth, I decide that either the text is corrupt, or the translator did not follow what was really said, or that I failed to understand it."²⁸ And the same St. Augustine in the book *De consensu evangelistarum* wishes to show that this consensus is not lacking in even the smallest things. And the tendency of St. Augustine has also been noted that, sometimes a bit exaggerated, *of seeking symbolism and mystical meanings* in those things that seem to be minimal and accidental.²⁹

117. St. Jerome in a countercharge that he had tried to make some changes in the Gospels, responds: "I am not so dull-witted nor so coarsely ignorant... as to suppose that

28. *Epist.* 82,1,3: ML 33,277; EB 127 [112]; R 1421.

29. V.gr., St. Augustine considers the symbolism of the number 38 (= 40 - 2), where the sick man was held by his infirmity for 38 years: *Tractatus 17 in Io* n.4: ML 35,1529.

any one of the Lord's words is either in need of correction *or is not divinely inspired*...³⁰ And again: "He will approve the whole body and back full of eyes [alluding to Ezek. 1:18], who sees that there is nothing in the Gospels that is not shining and illumines the world with it splendor, *so that also those things thought to be small and worthless shine with the majesty of the Holy Spirit*."³¹ And again: "... *the individual words, syllables, long marks over vowels and periods in the divine Scriptures are full of meaning*."³²

118. St. Chrysostom beautifully extols the value of the smallest sentence, where, among other things, he says: "... and those words of the Scriptures, *which are thought to be unimportant*, we do not ignore, *for they also are from the grace of the Spirit*...."³³ And "not the smallest saying, not one syllable contained in the divine Writings should be passed over."³⁴

St. Basil: "These things were said by me... it is certain that in the divinely inspired words not even one syllable is unimportant."³⁵

St. Gregory Nazianzen: "We however, who extend the accuracy of the Spirit to the merest stroke and tittle, will never admit the impious assertion that even the smallest matters were dealt with haphazardly by those who have recorded them, and have thus been borne in mind down to the present day."³⁶

And there are many references to this point, which we will cite below regarding the extension of inspiration *to the words themselves* (n.143,5); like the words of Origin: "the divine wisdom touches every scripture divinely given *even as far as one small letter*..."³⁷ Also several things touch on this matter which directly and immediately refer to the inerrancy of Scripture.³⁸

And even *Loisy* himself admits the consensus of the Fathers and the theologians of the Middle Ages and of the whole Church.³⁹

119. It is proved thirdly as a result from Vatican Council I (D 3006). The writing and inspiration of the sacred books proceed in a parallel way from the words of the Council: "... having been written by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit...."

But the author or writer of a book writes the individual sentences, even the smallest; and this at least pertains to the concept of a book.

Therefore also the inspiration of the sacred books extends to the individual or smallest sentences. Moreover, it would be absurd to say that

30. *Epist.* 27 (ad Marcellam) 1: R 1347.

31. *In Ezek* 1.1,15-18: ML 25,28 D.

32. *In Eph.* L.2 c.3: ML 26,512 A.

33. *Ad populum Antiochenum* hom.1,1: MG 49,17.

34. *In Gen* hom. 15,1: MG 53,119.

35. *In Exaem.* hom. 6,11: MG 29,143 C.

36. *Oratio* 2 n.105: R 979.

37. *In Ps* 1 n.4: R 483.

38. Below n.174,2. See also other testimonies of the Fathers, v.gr., St. Justin: R 149; St. Hippolytus: R 400.

39. *L'enseignement biblique* (1893) 4; this testimony can be read, v.gr., in Lercher-Schlagenhaufen n.574 in note 24.

inspiration ceases or is interrupted when the “obiter dicta” are written down; and there would be no obvious criterion to discern such an interruption.

120. Objections. 1. The argument from Scripture proves that Christ and the Apostles cited the words of Scripture under the formula *it is written*, as if they were true and infallible, but *not as inspired*.

Response. Directly often it is so: namely, they propose the truth of the quoted sentences. But they say they are true precisely, because *they are written*, i.e., because they have God as their author or because they are inspired.

2. The texts quoted from Holy Scripture are not “obiter dicta,” but are referred either to the law or to morals, or to dogmatic matters. Therefore Christ and the Apostles do not cite “obiter dicta” under the formula *it is written*.

Response. Often the words cited by Christ and the Apostles concern morals or have a religious meaning, because of a new typical sense, which they assume in the N.T. It is surely true that these things have this typical sense intended by God, already in the O.T., even if it became known in the New; but those words according as they have a literal meaning concern things that are purely indifferent and profane or merely historical. See Matt. 2:18 (on the weeping of Rachel: Gen. 35:19; Jer. 31:15).

3. If the individual sentences of Scripture are inspired, they are the word of God. If they are the word of God, they can be expressed in this way: *The Lord says this...* But it is ridiculous sometimes to speak in this way, v.gr., “The Lord says this: 2 Tim. 4:13: *the cloak that I left....*”

Response. Further on we will say (n.123ff.) in what sense and on what level the statements of Scripture can be said to be the word of God. If they are the word of God, they can be expressed: “The Lord says this...” as if they are *the word of God in the most proper sense*, since God is introduced as speaking or when a prophetic saying is stated in the name of God, *conceded*; they can be so stated when the hagiographer gives expression *to his own judgment, denied*. For then it is the word of God in the sense that God testifies and says that Paul, v.gr., has that judgment and that will, and inasmuch as God takes care to manifest this through the hagiographer.

4. The hagiographers, when they write things acquired by their human efforts (John 19:35; Luke 1:3), did not have them from divine inspiration. Therefore inspiration does not extend to everything.

I deny the antecedent. Even the things they write as a result of their own human effort they have from divine inspiration, as is explained in n.91.

5. Hagiographers sometimes so speak that they oppose themselves to God, as the authors of other thoughts. Therefore these thoughts do not proceed from divine inspiration. *I prove the antecedent* from 1 Cor. 7:12; *To the rest I say, not the Lord....*

Response. This statute (*the Pauline privilege concerning matrimony*) was promulgated or given immediately by Paul and not by the Lord, *conceded*; the writing of this statute of Paul is accomplished only by Paul and not by the Lord, *denied*. *Or in a different way:* This sentence is not immediately from God by reason of the matter, *conceded*; by reason of the writing or consignment, *denied*.

6. Sometimes the hagiographer confesses that what he writes is foolishness (2 Cor. 11:1.16f.21.23; v.17: *but what I am saying I say not with the Lord's authority but as a fool*). Therefore these words cannot be attributed to God.

Response. St. Paul says that he is speaking in some kind of hypothesis or lack of moderation (verse 10,) or in the hypothesis of a certain kind of thinking or human criterion (according to man), carnal, natural, not spiritual or supernatural, and therefore not of a wise man or even of fool. But with these words he is speaking *ironically* or *by a rhetorical figure of concession* (v.16: *accept me like a fool*). Therefore he is not affirming simply that what he is saying is foolishness, except ironically both as an hypothesis and by a figure of concession. Therefore he does not say this about his own writing, nor does God say it: namely, that it is real foolishness.

Therefore putting the argument in form: Paul is saying that what he writes is truly and simply foolishness, *denied*. *I also distinguish the consequent.* God cannot write true foolish statements, *conceded*; God cannot say that Paul made a hypothesis and concession as if Paul were foolish, *denied*.

7. Sometimes the hagiographers manifest doubts or ignorance (Prov. 30:18f.; 1 Cor. 1:16; 2 Cor. 12:2f.), or speak indeterminately (John 2:6; 6:19). But God cannot doubt or be in ignorance, and he knows everything determinately. Therefore these sentences cannot be said by God.

I distinguish the major. In these things which the hagiographers say the doubt or ignorance of God is expressed, or that he knows things indeterminately, *denied*; God then is saying that *the hagiographer doubts or does not know, or knows indeterminately, conceded*.

8. There are some sentences of Scripture, which do not agree with the original, v.gr., in 1 Cor. 15:51: *We shall all rise, but we shall not all be changed*; but in the Greek it reads: *We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed*. Therefore not all the sentences of Scripture are inspired.

Response. We are speaking about the extension of inspiration to all the sentences of the *original* text; about the apographa and the versions, like the Vulgate, only *equivalently*, inasmuch as they faithfully render the original meaning.

You will say. That can also be said about the Vulgate, that its sentences correspond to the original sentences; since it has been declared to be authentic (see n.148ff.).

Response. The Vulgate has been declared to be authentic *as in the course of the centuries it has been proved by its use in the Church*. But the quoted text was critically doubtful.

9. In Scripture there are obscure things. Therefore these things come from the hagiographer, not from God.

I concede the antecedent. I deny the consequent and the consequence. God can through the human instrument propose obscure things *without error*, because of different ends, v.gr., that faith and attention be stirred up more... And note that the obscurity

often is present more in the translated versions than in the original.

10. Sometimes the hagiographer allows that what he says may be freely judged (v.gr., 1 Cor. 10:15: *I speak as to sensible men*; JUDGE FOR YOURSELVES WHAT I SAY). But it is not allowed to judge freely about the divine words. Therefore not everything in Scripture is the word of God.

Response. St. Paul says that by a rhetorical figure of *approbation*, that they may judge with an approving judgment, *conceded*; he allows that they may judge everything with a discriminating or doubtful judgment, *denied*. (St. Peter already had said in 2 Pet. 1:20: *First of all you must understand this, that no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation*).

11. But according to Paul they can freely judge about all things with a discerning and doubtful judgment. *Proof.* 1 Thess. 5:20f.: *Do not despise prophesying, BUT TEST EVERYTHING; hold fast what is good.*

Response. And here Paul is dealing with strictly written things, *denied*; he is dealing with the testing of charisms and about things *said* and indeed by *private* persons, *conceded*.

12. Sometimes the sacred author seeks to strengthen his own human authority so that faith will be given to his words, v.gr., *Gal. 2:9*; *2 Cor. 11:22*. But God, in order to procure faith in his own words, cannot appeal to human authority. Therefore in Scripture not everything is said by God.

Response. Sometimes the hagiographer introduces narrations or presents considerations, in order to gain for himself authority and so that men will more easily believe him; then *God says that those narrations and judgments are true*, and these are also the judgments of God; but I deny the supposition that these are the words of God *in the most proper sense* and by reason of the matter, as if the saying were made by God.

13. The individual charisms and actual graces, as they have their own purposes, so also they have their own limits according to the ends proposed. But the purpose of the hagiographers was to teach us religious things, not profane. Therefore the charism of the hagiographers, the inspiration, has its own limits, according to the intended religious end. Therefore not all the sentences are inspired.

I distinguish the major. The charisms have their own ends intended either for their own sake or because of something else, and their own limits according to the ends intended either for their own sake or because of something else, *conceded*; they have ends intended only for their own sake, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor and the first consequent.* Therefore inspiration has its own limits according to the end intended for its own sake or because of something else, *conceded*; only according to the end intended for its own sake, *denied*.

14. If God writes profane things, he is acting as a simple historian which is unfitting for God.

Response. If God should write only history or profane things, *I bypass that point*; if while he is writing profane things or things for a primary religious purpose, he writes them not without taste, but elegantly and with the concrete circumstances, although at times they may seem to be purely profane, this is unfitting for God, *denied*.

15. If God writes the "obiter dicta," they are articles of faith. But this seems to be not right.

Response. These "obiter dicta" are *of divine faith, conceded*; they are *articles of faith*, i.e., principal truths in the body of dogma, *denied*.

16. In Scripture are found actual affections of evil in the hagiographer, v.gr., imprecations (see Ps. 109, etc.). Therefore these thoughts cannot be from God.

Response. In Scripture actual affections of evil of the hagiographer cannot be found. With regard to this and regarding the imprecations see n.124-127.

17. Just as the prophets sometimes when they are consulted, from their great custom of prophesying, utter some things from their own spirit⁴⁰; so also the inspired authors can do the same. Therefore not everything is inspired by God.

Response. The prophets do that, if it is not certain that they are acting from the divine Spirit, *I bypass that*, and see what we say in n.122,29; if it is certain that they have been led by a true prophetic inspiration, *denied*. Concerning the inspired authors, since it is certain that they were moved to write by true inspiration, that cannot be admitted.

121. FROM THE HEAD OF THE MAGISTERIUM OF THE CHURCH. 18. The infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is restricted to matters of faith and morals, like the infallibility of the Church (D 3073). Therefore also the inspiration of the sacred books.

I deny the parity. The infallibility of the Roman Pontiff is given for special circumstances, that is, when he speaks *ex cathedra* on matters of faith and morals, and it is had, like the infallibility of the Church, *through the divine assistance*, which is granted for matters of faith and morals, and indirectly at least for other profane things connected with the religious (see n.239ff.); *and beyond this nothing else is proved*. But inspiration is the quality of a book whereby God is simply the author of the book; and it is repugnant that he is not the author of all the sentences, *as is proved abundantly*.

19. Scripture is subject to the Church. Therefore also the inspiration of Scripture cannot have a greater extension than the infallibility of the Church.

I distinguish the antecedent. Scripture is subject to the Church, inasmuch as it must be guarded and explained by the magisterium of the Church, *conceded*; *by reason of its origin*, inasmuch as the sacred book is a book formally of God as the author, *denied*; and note that the acts of the magisterium of the Church are acts formally of men.

20. According to Trent no one may twist Holy Scripture according to his own mind contrary to the meaning that Holy Mother the Church has held and holds *in matters of faith and morals that pertain to the building up of Christian doctrine* (D 1507). Therefore also the inspiration of the sacred books extends only to matters of faith and morals.

I deny the consequence. It is one thing to speak positively, as it is said in Trent, that the infallibility of the Church *covers matters of faith and morals regarding the interpretation of the sacred books* (see n.233-235),

40. See v.gr. St. Gregory the Great, *In Ezek hom.* 1 n.16: ML 76,793; below, n.122,29.

and it would be something else to deny that God is the author of all the sentences, even of the “*obiter dicta*” of the sacred books. The first point is said in Trent; the second is not said, nor does it follow from the Council.

21. The end of the Tridentine declaration on accepting the sacred books *is to confirm dogmas and renew morals* (D 1505), by means of the inspired Holy Scripture. But from the end the meaning and extension of some statement must be interpreted. Therefore the inspiration of Scripture must be understood only from those things that contribute to the confirmation of dogmas and the renewal of morals.

I distinguish the major. The remote end of the Tridentine declaration is to confirm dogmas and renew morals, *conceded*; the proximate end, *denied*; for it is to declare where divine revelation is contained, namely, in tradition and in Holy Scripture, whose whole books are accepted as they are had in the old Vulgate Latin edition. *I distinguish the minor.* The meaning of some saying is to be interpreted from the remote end only, *denied*; from that end also, *conceded*.

22. As in the authentically declared Vulgate some genuine or doubtful (see n.155ff.) sentences are not present, so also in the sacred books some sentences “*obiter dicta*” cannot be inspired.

I deny the parity, because concerning the “*obiter dicta*” there is certainty *from the given proofs*; but concerning the genuineness of all the sentences of the Vulgate there is no certainty, but *the contrary is certain*; see n.158 and 160. Moreover, there would be no objective norm to distinguish the inspired sentences from the non-inspired.

23. If every original sentence of Scripture is inspired, it is the word of God and *it pertains to the deposit of faith*. But what is the word of God pertaining to the deposit of faith cannot be lost, and some of the original “*obiter dicta*” of Scripture have been lost. Therefore not every sentence of Scripture is inspired.

I distinguish the major. Every inspired sentence of Scripture pertains to the deposit of faith, *if it is a sentence per se revealed, conceded*; if it is *per accidens* revealed, *I subdistinguish*: if with the loss of this sentence the totality of truths per se revealed cannot stand, *conceded*; otherwise, *I ask for your proof. I concede the minor and deny the consequent and the consequence*.

Therefore there can be some inspired (and revealed) sentences which were in the original texts, that are now lost, which did not pertain to the deposit of faith. These texts were useful or necessary *for the temporal purpose* of the sacred books (think about the genealogies, the names of plants, chronologies...), but they were not necessary *for the permanent and general purpose* of these books.⁴¹

You say: God had to see to it that not the least sentence inspired by him would be lost.

Response. God is not required to do what is best according to our way of thinking.

41. On these matter, see De San, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura* (Bruges 1903) n.368; Müller, *De verbo Dei revelato*² (Innsbruck 1923) th.13 n.80-83; Lercher, *Theologia fundamentalis* (1927) n.586; Lercher-Schlagenhaufen, n.586.

122. *From the Fathers.* 24. Origen says: "... that word, which was written [in three days Nineveh will be destroyed: Jon. 3:4] and did not take place, seems to have been spoken by Jonah rather than by God... and those things spoken through the prophets are not always accepted as if they were spoken by God."⁴²

Response. Origen in this place is treating the things which the prophets say, not about words *written as written*, and he refers the saying of Jonah to Jonah himself, which is not found in the words of the Lord (Jon. 3:2).

25. Origen again: "... Paul... says: *all scripture is inspired by God and profitable*; and when he says: *I say this, not the Lord*; and this: *Thus I directed all the churches*; and likewise: *What I suffered in Antioch, Iconium, Lystra*, and things similar to these, at times written by him, and according to his power, but not according to the accurate integrity of the words which come from divine inspiration..."⁴³ Therefore he does not think everything is inspired.

Response. Origen is speaking about the difference in superiority which exists between the Gospel and the other scriptures, *by reason of the matter*, and he calls the Gospel the first fruits of all Scripture; therefore the others are also Scripture.

26. St. Basil: "... every rational creature *at one time speaks from himself*, and at another time the things of God, as when Paul says: *Now concerning virgins I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion...* And sometimes Moses: *I am not eloquent, but slow of speech and tongue* [Exod. 4:10]. But sometimes he himself: *Thus says the Lord, Let my people go so they can serve me* [Exod. 5:1]."⁴⁴

Response. He is alluding to those things which *by reason of the matter* are not the words of God in the strictest sense, which are reported as having been said by God. But he clearly acknowledges in the same place that everything is from the Spirit: "All divinely inspired Scripture is useful, because the Spirit has uttered it."⁴⁵

27. St. Chrysostom alluded to the words of St. Paul (Acts 23:6f.), when, knowing about those present that some were Sadducees and some were Pharisees, he cried out: I am a Pharisee... I am being judged because of my hope for the resurrection of the dead.... And then there was an argument between the Pharisees and the Sadducees; and Chrysostom said: "Again [Paul] is speaking in a human way, and he does not always have the use of grace; but he is also allowed to say something from himself...."⁴⁶

Response. Chrysostom alludes to the sermon of Paul, in which he is not acting from revelation, and on the basis of his own human cleverness he wants to divide his adversaries... He is not dealing with the inspiration of the sentences of Acts.

28. Chrysostom again: "But he who says everything from the Spirit does not

42. *In Num* hom. 16,4: MG 12,693 BD.

43. *In Io* 1,5: MG 14,28.

44. *Adversus Eunomium* 5,2: MG 29,765 B.

45. *Ibid.*: MG 29,765 A.

46. *In Act* hom. 49,1: MG 60,337.

labor."⁴⁷ But the hagiographers labored to find many things. Therefore for them many things are not from the Spirit.

Response. Chrysostom is treating the excellence of prophecy over human teachers, because in that charism *everything* is from the Spirit, and nothing from the human part: "and therefore, he says, he placed [the teacher] after the prophet; for the latter is totally a gift, but the former is just human labor."

29. St. Gregory the Great: "Also it should be known that sometimes the holy prophets, when they are consulted, from their great custom of prophesying utter some things from their own spirit, and they are thought to say these things from their own spirit of prophecy...."⁴⁸

Response. St. Gregory is dealing with the things that the prophets sometimes *say*, not about their words *written inasmuch as they are written*.

30. The Fathers bearing witness to the universal extension of inspiration to every sentence, did that because they did not know about the modern scientific difficulties and they could handle them more easily than we can.

1) *I bypass and deny the consequence.* For the authority of the Fathers does not force us to accept the explanations they propose as private teachers and in a particular case of solving difficulties; but the magisterium forces us and the consensus of them as witnesses to something revealed or to something connected with revealed truth, for example in this case, when they bear witness that inspiration extends to the "obiter dicta."

2) The Fathers at times had great difficulties to solve; and they did not try to avoid them by denying that inspirations extends to profane things..., but by adhering firmly to the doctrine handed on by their seniors, they correctly thought that the objections raised against it have no value.

In what sense and to what degree are the individual sentences of Scripture said to be the "word of God"

Pesch, n.436-450; Bea, n.68-72; Tromp, *De inspiratione*⁵ prop.7.

123. If inspiration extends to absolutely every sentence of Scripture, God as the author of every sentence through them wants to communicate something to us. Therefore all the sentences of Scripture are the "word of God." And so the Church calls Scripture *the written word of God* (D 3011; CIC cn.1323 § 1).

Therefore all things that are in Scripture are the word of God *by reason of inspiration or, as is usually said, by reason of consignation*.

But *by reason of the matter* this cannot be predicated about every

47. In 1 Cor hom. 32,1: MG 61,265.

48. In Ezek hom. 1,16: ML 76,793.

sentence in the same way.

Thus there are found in Scripture:

a) *sayings that are recounted as spoken directly by God or by Christ the Lord* (even according to his human nature), and these are *the word of God in the most proper sense, namely, by reason of consignation and of the matter*; v.gr., Rev. 2:1ff.: "To the angel of the Church in Ephesus write: The words of him who..."; Acts 10:13; 11:7; or when the prophets said: "Thus says the Lord...."

b) Also things are narrated that *God said through an angel, a legate... or what the Apostles say as infallible ambassadors of God, and these, besides the reason of consignation, are the words of God in a mediated way and indirectly, because of the mission of the legate.*

c) There are other things that *the hagiographer takes from Holy Scripture, and these things are the word of God twice by reason of consignation*; or the things said by others under prophetic inspiration (v.gr., Luke 1:42: Elizabeth is full of the Holy Spirit; Luke 1:46ff.: the *Magnificat*; Luke 1:67ff.: the *Benedictus*), and here there is a *prophetic speaking and at the same time inspired speaking* because of consignation.

d) There are other things that the hagiographer derived from different sources or thought because of his own personal effort, and *he speaks in his own name*, and these are *the word of God inasmuch as God wills to manifest them through the hagiographer*, that is, he uses the hagiographer as a rational instrument.

124. *As a consequence of the preceding we draw the following conclusions:* 1) *The narrations, arguments, insinuations, statements of the hagiographer:* are at the same time his judgments and the judgments of God himself (see D 3628; EB 420 [433]).

But if probability or a doubt, or ignorance, or conjecture or something indefinite it expressed, this does not take place on the part of the divine knowledge, which is always certain and complete, but on the part of the terminus of the divine cognition, that is, God says that the hagiographer did not draw from certain sources, or doubted, or did not know, or knows something by conjecture or in an indeterminate way. Surely it is one thing for *God not to know or to doubt...* (which cannot happen); and something else for *God to assert the doubt, ignorance... of the hagiographer.*

The expression of such doubt or ignorance, etc., is not lacking in some purpose; for, in addition to the fact that something is already known, although in an indeterminate way, from that often we can conclude to something certain. Thus, v.gr., 1 Cor. 1:16 shows that St. Paul left to

others, for the most part, the administration of Baptism.

2) *If the hagiographer says that other profane authors said something or wrote something:*

if he merely reports it, without approval or disapproval, then God testifies that it is a true reference or that they really did say that or wrote it; and this is the word of God.

if also those things are approved or praised, God also approves or praises them: see Matt. 12:32-34; Tit. 1:12; Job 42:7.⁴⁹

if they are reprovved, God also reproves them: John 8:49.

If the hagiographer refers to a profane source without naming the source, then there is a *tacit or implicit citation* (see n.176,3; 186): and it must be held that the hagiographer takes responsibility for that so long as it is not demonstrated by solid arguments that he neither approves that citation nor makes it his own, so that he is rightly thought not to be speaking in his own name (D 3372; EB 160 [153]]).

3) *Regarding the acts of will of the hagiographer*: commands, counsels...it is expressed implicitly that these acts really were present or are present, and this is also the judgment of God; but *the commands and counsels are acts of the hagiographer alone*, if he is speaking in his own name (v.gr., 1 Cor. 7:12; 11:17; 1 Tim. 5:23). For then they are inspired by reason of their consignation, not by reason of the matter.

But if the counsels are doctrinal judgments on the usefulness or suitability of some thing, then what we said about judgments under 1) holds true.

4) *Regarding a narration or assertion of affections of the hagiographer himself*, the judgment that such affections were present or are present is also the judgment of God.

On the uprightness or moral goodness of past affections of the hagiographer, nothing is affirmed by their consignation in the inspired book. The same holds with regard to their natural or supernatural character.

However, *concerning the present affections of the hagiographer* (and regarding the present acts of his will), v.gr., affections of love, hate, hope, admiration, joy sorrow...: since the hagiographer seems to approve his present deliberate affection, and since God is moving him to write, and the writing, like the oral expression of some internal act, is morally one

49. But from this it does not follow that each and every saying of Job was praised; see Job. 42:3.

with the internal act, therefore *the present affection of the hagiographer must be morally good* and a present bad affection cannot be reconciled with the inspiration of the book.

The same thing holds true for the present acts of his will.

125. 5) On the imprecations.⁵⁰ In order to explain the imprecations that are read in Scripture (v.gr., Ps. 7; 35; 52; 58:7-12; 59:6-16; 69:23-29; 79:6.12; 109:6-19; 137:6-9...) it is certainly necessary to pay attention *to the hyperbolic tendency of the Orientals* and to the symbols and to the poetically exaggerated descriptions; but *not to the hardness of morals of the ancients*; because, since Holy Scripture is inspired by God, only those things that are morally good can be inspired by God.

Nor can recourse be made to the moral imperfection of the O.T. Of course it is true that the O.T. is related to the N.T. as the less perfect to the more perfect; but not as moral evil to moral good. Now hatred of enemies is an act that is not just less perfect, but it is morally evil. But in the N.T. imprecations are not lacking (v.gr., Acts 8:20; 18:6; Gal. 1:8f.; Rev. 6:10; 18:6f.20).

But it helps to note, regarding the imprecatory Psalms of David, *that they are composed by an author who in other circumstances was known to be of a gentle nature* (v.gr., 1 Sam. 24 and 26: with Saul; 2 Sam. 4:9-11: David vindicates the killing of his rival Ish-bosheth; 2 Sam. 9: and he wanted to show mercy to those who remained of the house of Saul; 2 Sam. 16:5-14: he treated in a kindly manner Shimei who was cursing him and throwing rocks at him and at his servants). Hence rightly other explanations have been thought of in order to solve the difficulties which come from the imprecations.

Now *according to St. Thomas*,⁵¹ "the imprecations contained in Holy Scripture may be understood in four ways. First, *according to the custom of the prophets to foretell the future under the veil of an imprecation...*"; and therefore they can be understood "by way of prediction, not by way of wish, so that the sense is: *May the wicked be, that is, the wicked shall be, turned into hell*"⁵²; and sometimes the Vulgate uses the optative mood

50. On the imprecations, see S.Th. II-II, q. 83, a. 8 ad 1; q. 25, a. 6 a 3; R. Cornely, *Introductio in V.T. libros sacros* II/2, second edition (Paris 1897) n.195 p.120-123; Pesch, n.447; *Institut. Biblicae* 1⁶ 1.1 n.78; Bea, *De inspiratione* n.71; B. Santos Olivera, *De imprecationibus in psalmis*: VerDom 4 (1924) 143-148; A. Vaner heeren, *De honestate, consecratio inspirationis*: CollatBrug 26 (1926) 346-358; M. de Tuyra, O.P., *El problema biblico de las "imprecaciones": principios de solución*: CiencTom 78 (1951) 171-192; 79 (1952) 3-29.

51. II-II, q. 83, a. 8 ad 1.

52. II-II, q. 25, a. 6 ad 3.

where the TM uses the simple future.⁵³

"Secondly, in the sense that certain temporal evils are sometimes inflicted by God on the wicked for their conversion." St. Thomas says the same thing in another place: "If a man commands or desires another's evil under the aspect of good, it is lawful; and it may be called cursing, not strictly speaking, but accidentally, because the chief intention of the speaker is directed not to evil but to good."⁵⁴

"Thirdly, because they are understood to be pronounced, not against the men themselves, but against the kingdom of sin, with the purpose, that is, of destroying sin by the correction of men." Note also that the hagiographer speaks sometimes *not as a private person* against a private enemy, *but in the name of God or of the chosen people against the enemies of God and of the kingdom of God*, which kingdom was the people of Israel itself.

"Fourthly, by way of conformity of our will to the divine justice with regard to the damnation of those who are obstinate in sin."

126. *On Psalm 109.* The imprecations, which are truly harsh and are read in Ps. 109:6-19 (unless they are placed in the mouth of David's enemies directed against David himself [see v.5.20], according to what will be said below), contain in the oriental *hyperbolic* manner the amplification of the just desire for the humiliation of sinners, as enemies of God, and so that God, *for the sake of his own name* (see v.21.27) may stand by his promises. But while such humiliation is desired, something that is not morally bad, certainly if it is desired as a reproach or for a sense of justice, at the same time it becomes *a prediction of the things that de facto will happen* (see n.125). And St. Peter (Acts 1:20) understands it as said about Judas or he accommodated it to him (v.8: *May his days be few; may another seize his goods* [office]).

However, according to other authors⁵⁵ the imprecating words can be supposed to be spoken by the enemies of David against David (v.4f.: *in return for my love they accuse me, even as I made prayer for them. So they reward me evil for good, and hatred for my love*; v.20: *May this be the reward of my accusers from the Lord, of those who speak evil against my life*). As a recommendation for this interpretation note how David speaks about his enemies (v.3-5) in the plural number; but afterwards the imprecation against them does not appear in the plural number, but suddenly the imprecation is made against someone in the singular number (v.6ff. *Appoint a wicked man against him...*); and this is

53. As St. Augustine says, *In Ps 34* n.8 (ML 36,128): "the things said with a figure of desiring are explained by the spirit of prophesying. May this *happen* and may that *happen*, is nothing other than *this and that will take place*." Also *In Ps 109* n.7 (ML 37,1435): "in the words as it were of one wishing evil, we understand the predictions of the one prophesying."

54. II-II, q. 76, a. 1 c.

55. F. Zorell, having added some very strong reasons, offers a review of those who prefer to use the following way of interpreting the imprecations: *Psalterium ex hebraeo latinum*² (Rome 1939) 277-279. But the difficulties, which this interpretation has, are proposed by the professors of the Pontifical Biblical Institute, *Liber Psalmorum cum canticis Breviarii Romani*² (Rome 1945) in the Introduction on page 108.

easily understood to be the hatred that the enemies have against David for his love (v.5), because they have spoken against him with lying tongues (v.2f.).

In this interpretation the words of Peter about Judas would be either an accommodation or they would say that *it was necessary* (Greek, in the aorist) *that Scripture be fulfilled...* (Acts 1:16) *concerning Judas*; this is meant in the sense that indeed his enemies curse Christ, but the imprecations fall back on his enemies, also according to Scripture (Gen. 12:3; Ps. 7:17); and so it could be said about Judas: *May his days be few; may another seize his goods* [office].

127. 6) *Regarding the affections and acts of will of others*, which are mentioned in Scripture, it is asserted that they really did have these acts and affections, and this is the word of God; but essentially nothing is said about their approval or recrimination.

Thesis 6. Verbal inspiration in the sense of a “mechanical dictation” is not generally to be admitted.

Pesch, n.451-467; Müller, *De verbo Dei revelato* th.14; Lercher (1927) n.570-580; Höpfl-Gut, n.70-72.

128. Although today verbal inspiration in the sense of a “mechanical dictation” is not defended, still, for the sake of completeness and in order to understand the error *through excess* in order to explain inspiration, it seems necessary to handle this question.

129. Definition of terms. *Verbal inspiration* can be conceived in two ways, and de facto it has been conceived in two way.

One way is a *mechanical dictation* of the words by God himself, or a quasi revelation or determination or suggestion of each and every word. Thus the hagiographer would be an amanuensis writing down what God would dictate.

Another species of verbal inspiration can be called *psychological*, inasmuch as the material words psychologically are connected with internal concepts and with the sentences. For, a book does not exist without sentences, ideas and words; and therefore the inspiration falling on a book, falls also on the words. About verbal inspiration conceived in this way there will be a consideration below in n.136ff.

Since we deny the mechanical dictation of the words through inspiration, we do not want to deny the determination of the words sometimes in individual cases, *if it is proved* (v.gr., if someone should prove it for John 1:14: *And the word was made flesh...*; or also for some words like *Word, Wisdom...*). Thus we are saying that such dictation is not *generally* to be admitted.

130. Adversaries. This theory *coheres with the theory of mantic inspiration* for a prophecy, which Tertullian defended, after he became a Montanist¹; and previously the Alexandrian school of Philo² and Flavius Josephus³ held the same thing.

The old Rabbis explicitly defended this view while affirming the determination of the individual words, and also the shape of the letters by God.⁴

The older Protestants, whom some recent orthodox Protestants follow,

1. *Adversus Marc.* 4,22: ML 2,443.

2. See Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.15.; *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.1 n.55.

3. See *Antiquit.* 4,6f.: *Opera* (Didot) 1,126. Likewise *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.1 n.55.

4. See Pesch, n.23.

similarly are found saying that the syllables, letters and punctuation in the sacred writings come from God.

Thus A. Quenstedt (+ 1688), who among other things said it is blasphemy to wish to speak about solecisms and barbarisms in the sacred books, because thus God himself would be accused, who “infused the words themselves and the phrases into them [the hagiographers] and dictated and inspired the location and the connection of the words.”⁵

And according to the *Helvetian Formula of Consent* (1675): “... The Hebrew codex of the Old Testament, which we have received and still retain today from the tradition of the Jewish church, to whom formerly the oracles of God were given; we do this both regarding the consonants and regarding the vowels, whether the points themselves or at least the power of the points, and both regarding the things and regarding the words which are θεόπνευστος...” But this formula was abrogated in the year 1725.⁶

131. Doctrine of the Church. The documents of the Church that speak about inspiration suppose the personal and human work of the hagiographer, not the mere work of an amanuensis or mantic in an ecstasy.

Thus, v.gr., *Vatican Council I*, when explaining what inspiration consists of, says that the Church accepts the books as sacred “not because, having been carefully composed by mere human industry, they were afterward approved by her authority...” (D 3006). Therefore some human industry is implied in their composition.

Leo XIII (“*Providentissimus*”) describes this human and rational work of the hagiographer (D 3293).

Likewise Benedict XV (“*Spiritus Paraclitus*”) explains the teaching of St. Jerome contrary to mechanical dictation, who “moreover has no doubt but that each one of those authors [of the sacred books], depending on his own nature and talent, freely worked under the divine inspiration...” (EB 448 [461]), and he endorses the explanation of Leo XIII concerning the human work of the hagiographer (EB 452 [465]).

Theological note. The thesis is *certain and common*.

132. It is proved from Holy Scripture. From Scripture it is certain that the authors of the sacred books often conducted themselves *not merely passively* in writing a book, but worked and sweated, and attributed any defects to their own work. Thus Luke 1:3 in the prologue; and the author of

5. *Theologia didactico-polemica* s.2 q.3-6; Pesch, n.229.

6. Pesch, n.219.

2 Macc. (2:24-32; 15:39).

Likewise they quote documents from the sources (the books of Sam., Kings, Chron., 2 Macc.); hence it does not seem to be necessary, but superfluous, to say that God dictated them.

Also there is *a difference of style* in the different books; likewise grammatical and literary defects; there is *a different way of quoting* the words of Scripture merely to get the meaning (v.gr., Rom. 9:33 = Isa. 8:14; 28:16. Also 2 Sam. 22 = Ps. 18); a different way of quoting the words of the Lord in the institution of the Eucharist (Matt. 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24; Luke 22:19.20; 1 Cor. 11:23-25)... all of these factors do not suppose a mechanical dictation by one and the same divine principal author, but imply a different influence on the book from the instrument used.

133. It is proved from tradition. The Fathers inculcate *the value of the sentences* in the Scriptures, not precisely of the syllables and letters, unless they are for emphasis and oratorical effect (see n. 145,5).

Thus St. Jerome says: "Some chase after syllables and letters, you should concentrate on the sentences."⁷ And the same Jerome again: "And let us not think that the Gospel is in the words of the Scriptures, but it is in the meaning; not in the surface, but in the innermost part; not in the flow of words, but in root of reason."⁸ And Jerome attributes precisely to the diversity of hagiographers the difference in style which is found in the sacred books (see n. 145).

St. Augustine says about this: "[There was an accidental difference in the evangelists so that] at the same time also, in what pertains especially to faithful doctrine, we would understand that the truth must be sought or embraced not so much because of the words but because of the things, when those speak who do not use the same way of speaking, since they do not disagree on the things and the ideas, we see that they are firm in the same truth."⁹ And according to the same Augustine is it useful for the faith to have different forms of expression in the Gospels, "lest we think as it were with consecrated words in order to protect the truth, rather than with a variety of words to express the truth as God knows it, and his angels in him."¹⁰

134. Theological reasoning. *The dictation and determination of the words by God is not required in order for God to be the principal author of*

7. *Epist.* 57 (to Pamphylus) n.6: ML 22,572.

8. *In Gal* 1,11: ML 26,347.

9. *De consensus evangelist.* 2,12.28: ML 34,1091. See *ibid.*, through all of n. 28 and n.27.

10. *De consensus evangelist.* 2,66,128: ML 34,1139.

Scripture. For he is thought sufficiently to be the principal author of a book or letter, who induces someone else to write his own ideas and only those, and he takes care lest they be expressed with inept words.

This point is confirmed from the responses of the Biblical Commission, according to which Moses can also be considered the *author* of the Pentateuch, if others gave faithful expression to the ideas, conceived by Moses himself and approved by him after the writing (D 3395; EB 418 [431]).

Therefore God *can be* the principal cause of a sacred book, without determining the exact words to be written. But this fact of the determination of the words should not be asserted, which would be a supernatural fact, unless there is real certainty about it; for beings are not to be multiplied without necessity.

135. Objections. 1. Men change what they once wrote at another time. Therefore God also can express differently the things that he said to us in different books, by dictating in a different way to different authors.

Response. Men do that when they want to *correct* their own writing for a new edition, *conceded*; but this cannot be thought to apply to the Holy Spirit. Men do that when they report the words of others, *I subdistinguish*: generally, *denied*; sometimes, *I bypass that*. But note that the sacred authors do that when they report the words of others; and also note especially that we are not considering what could have been, but with what *de facto* is the case, regarding the dictation of words by God in a particular case. In addition, we do not deny that God *could have* determined the words in a particular case.

2. According to Jer. 36:18: Jeremiah *was speaking through his mouth as if he were reading to me* [Baruch] *all these words...* But one who reads, also reads particular words. Therefore particular words were given through the dictation of God.

Response. 1) If this were proved for this case and for this occasion, that does not prove that it is so for *all* cases and books.

2) Jeremiah is commanded to write not revelations which he was receiving at the time, but those *which he had received previously* (36:2), and which at least partially—as can be rightly supposed—he had already written down and had repeated in his preaching. Thus he could dictate them from memory, as if he were reading.¹¹

3. The hagiographers are commanded to write *the word of God* (passim). Therefore the words are received through dictation.

I distinguish the antecedent. They are commanded to write the *formal* words of God, i.e., the thoughts, *conceded*; the words material dictated by God, *I ask for the proof of this*.

4. The old theologians often argue from the words of Psalm 45:2: *My tongue is like the pen of a ready scribe*, and so they say that these words are inspired.¹² Therefore

11. See Knabenbauer, *Comment. In Ieremiam* 36:4; Pesch, n.381.

12. See v.gr. D. Bañez, *Scholastica commentaria in 1 partem q.1 a.8 prolog.*, second conclusion; see Pesch, n278.

the sacred author is like a pen, and the Holy Spirit is like a scribe. But a scribe dictates words. Therefore also the Holy Spirit.

Response. These words in the Psalm want to say that the author is so moved that he speaks *fluently*. But if the author of the Psalm is compared to the pen of a scribe, it does not mean therefore that everything in the comparison is to be stressed. The old theologians could use only the analogy and accommodation from the words of this Psalm.

5. Inspiration comprehends the complete writing of the book. But the writing of the book comprehends the material words. Therefore inspiration comprehends all those words.

I distinguish the antecedent. Inspiration comprehends the same thing as the writing of the book, with regard to its *formal part*, that is, with regard to the thoughts, *conceded*; with regard to the *material part* of the words, *I subdistinguish*: with verbal psychological inspiration, which we will treat next, *conceded*; with verbal inspiration of a mechanical dictation, *again I subdistinguish*: generally, *denied*; sometimes, *I bypass that*.

6. Inspiration must also comprehend the material writing of the words in a particular case. *Proof.* Just as a teacher moving the hand of a child writing is the principal cause of the definite material form of the lines, so also God using the hagiographer as an instrument is the principal cause of the definite material words of Scripture.

I deny the assumption. Regarding the proof, *I deny the parity*. The action of the teacher as the principal cause of the material writing cannot be without action in a definite form of the lines; but the action of God, as the principal cause of writing a book, can take place without the dictation of the words individually; in one case it concerns the material writing, but in another case it concerns a whole book—and these are different things. However, with these comments we do not deny that inspiration in some true sense, which we will consider next, extends even to the words.

Thesis 7. The theory of “psychological” verbal inspiration seems to be preferred.

Bea, n.53-59; Höpfl-Gut, n.107-120; *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ l.1 n.54-67; Bainvel, n.113-123; Pesch, n.468-472; *Supplementum* n.7-9; Tromp, *De inspiratione*³ prop.6 part 4.

136. State of the question. Having rejected verbal inspiration in the sense of a mechanical dictation or suggestion determining the individual words, *nevertheless all admit that inspiration in a certain way extends to the words*. But this influence extends not only to the mental words whereby the ideas and sentences are represented internally, but also to the material words of the imagination:

a) inasmuch as God chooses a definite hagiographer, endowed with certain natural gifts, using a particular language, and gifted with rhetorical artistry or a poetic nature, etc.;

b) inasmuch as God moves him to a definite literary form: poetic, didactic, oratorical, narrative...;

c) inasmuch as God assists him so that the writer is made infallible while he is actually writing with external words.

137. *But there is also a question whether there is another meaning and if there are other reasons why verbal inspiration, that is, the material words themselves, ought to be defended.*

This new sense can be expressed in this way: *God, as the principal cause of the book, influences not only the sentences or the meaning, not only the mental and internal composition of the things to be said, but also the words themselves or the external form of the speaking.*

138. Among the reasons offered in support of this affirmation, less pleasing are those that are derived by some authors from their previously defined concept of an instrumental cause, and their reasoning goes like this: God is the principal cause of the book, man is the instrumental cause; but the effect coming from the principal cause and from the subordinated instrumental cause *comes with the totality of the effect from both causes*; therefore the total writing of the sacred book, and therefore the material words, comes from God and from a man.¹

But this way of reasoning seems to be a priori, from a philosophical

1. See Bea, n.24. There you will find the authors cited in favor of this opinion: in general they are the so-called “Thomistic” authors. On the opinion of the ancients, like Melchior Cano, D. Bañez, Billuart... and in what sense they defended verbal inspiration, see the texts assembled by Pesch, n.277-280, and see *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ l.1 n.58f.; and Höpfl-Gut, n.111.

theory; but here the concern is with explaining the revealed fact of the inspiration of books—primarily from the sources of revelation. Moreover that reasoning seems to be called into question by some exceptions.²

Therefore the reason that is pleasing in order to affirm verbal inspiration is something else, as will appear below in the proof; but since especially it is derived from a certain “psychological” similarity: this is the reason for the name given to this theory.³ This theory wants to avoid any extraordinary violence, or that *vivisection*⁴ between the living elements of the inspired writing, that is, between the internal mental conception of things and ideas on the one hand, and the external form or elocution on the other hand.

139. Adversaries.⁵ Although the diversity among Catholic authors in this question is not great, if everything is considered which each one says or supposes⁶; it seems now that among the adversaries of this verbal “psychological” inspiration those should be mentioned who hold that it is not required that the inspiring action of God is extended to the material words themselves.

140. This is the opinion of L. Lessius.⁷

Thus *Cardinal Franzelin*, who distinguishes between *the formal part of a book* (the matter and the thoughts) and *the material part* (the words, external grammatical and literary form); but it suffices for someone to be the author of a book, if he sees to it that another cooperator writes his ideas and only those, provided that at the same time he takes care lest his own ideas are expressed with inept words. “If therefore God by his inspiration of things and ideas acts in such a way on the man inspired to write, that the written book *infallibly in virtue of the divine operation itself* truly and sincerely contains the ideas of God, it is necessary that it coheres with the divine inspiration itself or such divine operation is included in it, so that the man writing not only actually chooses, but also *infallibly chooses the apt signs* in order to express truly and sincerely the inspired matters and thoughts, and so it is rendered infallible by the apt choice of

2. There are some authors who, rejecting the theory presented above, admit that inspiration extends to words, but for other reasons. Thus Bainvel, *De Scriptura sacra* n.113-123; Merk, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁵ I.1 n.63-68: they accept the distinction introduced by Franzelin between the formal element and the material element of a book. See also Bea, n.25.

3. On this name, see Pesch, *Supplementum* n.8f.; Merk, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁵ I.1 n.66.

4. This name used first by Dausch, and then by Loisy and by others, has become famous in this whole controversy. See Pesch, n.454 in note 3.

5. On the whole evolution and history of these opinions in this matter, briefly, see *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ I.1 n.54-67.

6. See what Bea says in n.53.

7. On Lessius, see Pesch, n.283-287; Bea, n.16.

the words that pertain to the material part.”⁸ Hence this author derives the reason for the extension of inspiration to the words from the guiding of the *infallible choice of the apt words*, which choice is made and comes from the hagiographer himself.

Other authors have embraced the opinion of Cardinal Franzelin, or something similar, like F. Schmid, G.J. Crets, Cardinal Mazzella, J. Knabenbauer, Ch. Pesch, R. Cornely, Van Laak, Ae. Dorsch....⁹

141. S. Tromp, properly distinguishing between *real* writing and the *mental* writing of a book, concedes with regard to the real writing of a book, that each and every word, even to the extent that they are *these* words, at the same time are both from God and from man, according as the writing is subject to an *approving practical judgment*, that is, when the hagiographer judges that the real writing agrees with the mental writing or that the external sign properly expresses the things to be communicated.¹⁰ Therefore “the conception of things is simply from the divine illumination; *the words are also from the divine illumination*, however not necessarily because they are these words simply, but *because with these words, even if taken in a human way, it is judged aptly to be expressed what should be expressed.*”¹¹ Accordingly “psychological” verbal inspiration is not pleasing to this author, if the question deals with the composition or mental writing of a book, (having before one’s eyes those who understand it as a suggestion of the words). For, the choice of the apt words in order to express the inspired meaning is left to the proper activity of the hagiographer, although afterwards he, *with his own speculative approving judgment* of the chosen external form, supernaturally and infallibly judges concerning the suitability of the chosen external expression.¹²

142. Doctrine of the Church. There is no document of the Church’s Magisterium that theologically requires this explanation or theory which we have adopted. Also, there is nothing preventing one from being able to embrace the opinion of Cardinal Franzelin, or something similar; because theologically it suffices for the author of the book—that God is the author as to the formal part of the book (the matter and thoughts), leaving to the instrument the material part.

Indeed some *responses of the Biblical Commission* seem to favor this opinion, whereby analogous hypotheses are permitted: Thus *Moses* can be considered the *author of the Pentateuch*, if the work conceived by him

8. *Tractatus de divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁴ p.316ff., especially p.323. L. Arnaldich, O.F.M., wrote on the mind of Cardinal Franzelin concerning inspiration, *La naturaleza de la inspiración según el Cardenal Franzelin*: XIV Sem. Bibl. Española p.131-163.

9. See Höpfel-Gut, n.18; *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ l.1 n.62.

10. *De S.Scripturae interpretatione*⁵ p.94; and for the expression *approving practical judgment* p.88. See above, n.93.

11. *Ibid.*, p.99.

12. See *ibid.*, p.93-105.

under impulse of divine inspiration was committed to another person or to several persons, however in such a way that they faithfully render his meaning, write nothing contrary to his will, omit nothing, and finally when the work produced in this way is approved by the same Moses as the source and inspired author (D 3395; EB 182 [175]). Likewise *St. Paul* can be considered *the author of the Letter to the Hebrews*, even if someone else gave it the *form* which it now has (D 3593; EB 418 [431]).

Therefore from these points—you will say—God *can be* the principal cause of a book, but a man the instrumental rational cause, without God determining the words to be written or without his extending to it his positive influx.

Let it be so. But here we are not asking about what should be or about a mere possibility, but about *the fact*, namely, what God really did and what is said in a fitting way.

Theological note. We are adopting the theory of the thesis as *the more probable and more fitting explanation*.

143. Proof. 1) It cannot be denied, according to the ordinary way of speaking, that the author of a book not only manifests his ideas, but *ordinarily* also pays attention to the words and writes them down. For, ordinarily this is what it means to write a book. Therefore also God supernaturally influences the material words themselves when he inspires a book and becomes its author.

And the *extreme cases* of the Pentateuch and the Letter to the Hebrews, in which there are *special difficulties* regarding the human author, should not be offered as ordinary and typical cases. This would only prove that there can be grades in perfection of the concept of an “author.”

Since also *the whole sacred book* in its concrete form has been most kindly handed over to the Church by God, and because of the divine goodness caused principally for our good: it is rather to be presumed that the principal divine influx in its writing should be extended as much as possible, inasmuch as at the same time the divine condescension permits the use of man as his instrument.

Therefore it is right (i.e., it is more fitting) to consider the influx of God on the sacred books *de facto* as extending itself even to the material words.

2) *Psychologically* the sentences are connected with the ideas or the words, not only with the internal ones, but also *ordinarily* with the words in the imagination; and the words and the external form manifest the qualities of the thoughts and intellectual activity; hence if the thinking is

clear, definite, acute, vivid..., the external form will also have the same properties.

But if the action of God in inspiration affects the thoughts, naturally it will also affect the words in the imagination and the external form. Thus it is not necessary to embrace some form of "vivisection."

And this is even more the case, because inspiration does not necessarily suppose the infusion of new species by the revelation of new ideas, but it can affect the ideas of composing and dividing which are already in the mind of the hagiographer and for the most part are associated with concrete words.

3) In addition there is the fact that the *praxis of the holy Fathers and of their exegesis* explains and develops the literal meaning by relying, as a foundation, precisely on the *words* and on their signification. More fittingly, therefore, these words are understood as something given through the divine influx and not purely through the human.

4) Some words of Scripture, like Jer. 1:9 : *Behold, I have put my words in your mouth*, and similar events (although they look immediately at the prophetic inspiration), are explained more fittingly, if God influences not only the thoughts, but also their words, and analogically they are transferred to biblical inspiration.

5) Moreover, the statements of the holy Fathers praising the value and meaning of the *words*, if you discount the amplification and rhetorical emphasis regarding punctuation, syllables..., are understood more suitably *if the words themselves are from the Holy Spirit*.

Thus Origen says: "With the greatest care and zeal the Holy Spirit through the ministers of the word presented those words, lest the reason should ever be hidden from you according to which the divine wisdom influences every scripture given by God *even so far as one small letter...* We are thinking about everything written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, like the great providence, which hands on wisdom superior to the human, and through the divine letters introduced salutary documents to the human race, *and impressed signs of wisdom even, so to speak, on the individual letters according as each one is able to understand them.*"¹³

And St. Gregory Nazianzen: "We however, who extend the accuracy of the Spirit to the merest stroke and tittle, will never admit the impious assertion that even the smallest matters were dealt with haphazardly by those who have recorded them, and have thus been borne in mind down to the present day."¹⁴

St. John Chrysostom: "What is the meaning of this short saying: *But to Adam?* Why does he add the conjunction? Was it not sufficient to say, *To Adam?* It is not without

13. In Ps 1 n.4: R 483.

14. Orat. 2,105: R 979.

reason, and our reason for inquiring into such things is not for the sake of curiosity, but as trying diligently to interpret everything for you, we are teaching you that *no small saying, nor even one syllable contained in the divine writings should be passed over. For, they are not just any kind of words, but the words of the Holy Spirit, and therefore it is possible to find there a large treasure, even in one syllable.*"¹⁵

St. Jerome: "...individual words, *syllables, strokes, points* in the divine Scriptures are full of meaning."¹⁶

144. Scholium. However, you should not think of this influence of God on the words as if it were necessarily always *determining* the words themselves; for, that would be *a mechanical dictation or a suggestion* of the words. But this determination of the words and of the external form can be left, *under the influence certainly of the principal cause*, to the proper efficiency of the instrument; and of course to this instrument and its deficient power are to be attributed the grammatical mistakes, anacolutha, solecisms... and imperfections of style, which we see in the sacred writings, and the sacred authors themselves admit this (see 2 Macc. 15:38). For just as the incarnate Word of God assumed our miseries *without sin* (Heb. 4:15), so the written word of God contains the literary imperfections of men "without error."

145. And to this proper power of the instruments is to be attributed the variety, which is recognized in the style of the sacred authors, and which the holy Fathers acknowledged.

Thus St. Jerome: "*Concerning Isaiah* it should be known that his language is very skillful; that is because he was a nobleman of urbane culture and there was no coarseness mixed in with his eloquence..."¹⁷— "*Jeremiah* the prophet... in his language seems to be more rustic among the Hebrews like Isaiah and Hosea and some of the other prophets, but in his meaning he is their equal; that is because he prophesied by the same Spirit. Furthermore his simplicity of language comes from the place in which he was born. For that was Anathoth, which even today is a small village, about three miles from Jerusalem..."¹⁸ "...From this number of shepherds came Amos, the prophet, unskilled in speech but not in knowledge. For though him, as through all the prophets, the Holy Spirit was speaking."¹⁹

The diversity in quoting the words of Holy Scripture (v.gr., Rom. 9:33; Isa. 8:14; 28:16) or of the Lord (in the institution of the Eucharist) corresponds to the modal di-

15. *In Gen homil.* 15,1: MG 53,119.

16. *In Eph.* 3,6: ML 26,512 A.

17. *Praef. In Isa:* ML 28,825.

18. *Prolog. in Jer:* ML 28,903.

19. *Prolog. in Amos:* ML 25,1038. See Pesch, n.111.

versity (not regarding the substance of the matter or of the thought) whereby God, the principal author, willed that the words and deeds be recounted by the instruments which he used.

146. Objections. 1. If verbal inspiration is admitted in the original text, then Holy Scripture has lost a large part, since now we do not have the original texts of some books.

Response. Holy Scripture has not perished, as inspired, because we also have authentic versions of these books (see n.148ff.), and *inspiration applies also to the versions "equivalently,"* since they render faithfully the thoughts and form of the original text.

2. If the hagiographer entrusts to an amanuensis the task of writing what he dictates, and also commits to him the correction of the style, then there is an inspired book in which at least several words, coming from the amanuensis, are not inspired. Therefore verbal inspiration, howsoever it is considered as "psychological," cannot be admitted.

Response. In this case it is better to call the amanuensis a *secretary*, and inspiration would fall also on him, depending of course on the primary author (see n.100). But this inspiration in the secretary or in sub-inspired authors is not to be conceived as a supernatural influx from God in the primary author, and from him redounding physically into the sub-inspired authors, but it is a supernatural influx of God, who provides for everything which is required in the process of writing a book.

3. It is easy to think that God remains the author of a book, if he is the author of the ideas and of the things to be said, leaving to men the external form, providing it is suitable.

I bypass that. For we are not dealing with the question about what *absolutely* could be said or conceived, but we are dealing with *what is said or conceived more fittingly.*

4. There is no necessary psychological connection between the mental concept and the external word of the imagination. Therefore a psychological reason for verbal inspiration should not be affirmed.

I distinguish the antecedent. There is no psychological connection naturally necessary between the concept of the mind and the cooperation of the phantasm, *denied*; there is no psychological connection naturally necessary between the concepts of the mind and the corresponding words in the imagination, *I subdistinguish*: sometimes, accidentally, when an apt word does not occur for the idea which we already have, *conceded*; ordinarily and essentially, as a general rule, *denied*. And please note that we are not considering what can be thought absolutely, *but what de facto exists and what is said to be more fitting.*

5. According to St. Thomas "an intellectual vision which includes a judgment and supernatural acceptance, is more noble than that which includes with the judgment an

imaginary acceptance. And in this regard it must be granted that a prophecy, which includes an intellectual vision only, is more worthy than one that has an imagination connected with it."²⁰ Therefore, likewise, biblical inspiration which would be only for intellectual ideas would be more worthy than one that has imaginary words connected with it.

Response. While we admit the teaching of St. Thomas "*And in this regard,*" please note that we are not considering what is *more worthy* or more excellent in itself, but what *de facto* is said *more truly*, especially in a matter which is not concluded in the knowledge alone of the hagiographer, but is ordained completely to a sensible and written manifestation. And St. Thomas himself says: "... *in both types of prophecy* [that which has an intellectual vision only, and that which has imagination joined to it] *there is a derivation of the prophetic light from the intellect to the imagination*, but in different ways: because in the prophecy which is said to have only an intellectual vision, the total fullness of the prophetic revelation is perceived in the intellect, and from there according to the choice of the one knowing [you would say for biblical inspiration: according to the choice of the hagiographer, i.e., according to the nature of the instrument being used; see n.145] images according to the nature of our intellect are formed suitably in the imagination, which cannot understand without the phantasms; but in the other type of prophecy [to which biblical inspiration is more fittingly assimilated, since it is in the order of writing, which of itself demands images] the whole fullness of the prophetic revelation is not received in the intellect, but partly in the intellect with regard to the judgment, and partly in the imagination with regard to the acceptance...."²¹

20. *De veritate* q. 12 a.12 c.

21. *Ibid.*, ad 2.

ARTICLE VI

ON THE RELATION OF THE TRANSLATIONS TO THE INSPIRED ORIGINALS (AUTOGRAPHS)

147. We said that inspiration extends to all the *original* sentences of the sacred books, since in the apographa or copies and in the translations the action of God inspiring and the action of the human writing is not involved directly, and therefore some errors could creep in. Therefore there is a question as to how inspiration is related to the apographa and the translations.

It must be said that *the apographa and the translations are inspired equivalently* (see n.106), inasmuch as they faithfully render the words and meaning of the original text. Therefore, if it is certain that the apographa and the translations are in conformity with the original text, then they vindicate for themselves the same faith that is due to the word of God.

But are there some translations concerning which it is certain that they render the meaning of the original text and which we can trust absolutely? This question is of great interest to us and it has always been a concern of the Magisterium of the Church. This is a question *about the authenticity of the translations*, and above all about the authenticity of the Vulgate.

On the authenticity of the Vulgate

St. Robert Bellarmine, *De edition latina Vulgata* (Auctarium Bellarminianum, ed. Le Bachelet, Paris 1913) 439-448; Ioannes Mariana, *Pro editione Vulgata dissertatio* (Migne, Scripturae sacrae cursus complete s 1, 587-698), especially c.18ff.; Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁴ 473-510; A. Vaccari, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.3 n.127-131; R. Cornely-A. Merk, *Introductionis Compendium*¹⁰ 1 n.95-100; A. Durand, *Vulgate Latine*: DAFC 4, 1970-1980; E. Mangelot, *Vulgate*: DB 5, 2484-2490.

148. The notion of authenticity. The word *authentic* (from αὐθεντέω = with force, I have authority) signifies to have value or *the power to demand assent or to produce faith*. It is said about a book, inasmuch as it either really contains what it is said to be or to contain it.

The authenticity of a book can be *original*, which is found in the autographs themselves or in the original texts; and this is *full and primary* authenticity.

As distinct from this, there can be another *authenticity of conformity*, which consist in conformity with the original authentic thing.

This authenticity of conformity can be *internal*, consisting of the formal agreement of the text with the original; and *external*, that is, according as it is recognized externally as correct, and presupposes the internal agreement.

This external authenticity can be merely *private or scientific* and critically proved; and it can be *public*, if it is declared by the authority of a society. This is therefore *juridical* authenticity, that is, which rightly has value for argumentation and to demand faith.

On the history of the VULGATE, see above, *On Revelation* n.205-207.228.

149. The declarations of the Council of Trent.¹ *The first indirect declaration.* The Council of Trent, already from the beginning, as all understand “will lay down the foundation of the profession of faith and what witnesses and supports it will especially use in strengthening its teachings and renewing morals in the Church”; and it declared that it would examine, besides the traditions of the Apostles, all the books with all their parts, “*as they are being read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate editions*” (D 1504-1505). This *dogmatic* decree, as is certain from its language, is also an *indirect declaration of the authenticity of the Vulgate*.

150. *Another declaration* of the same authenticity, *direct*, is contained in the following decree, in which the Council “*declares and decrees: This same ancient*

Vulgate edition which has been preserved in the Church for so many centuries *is to be regarded as authentic in public readings, disputations, sermons, and expositions, and let no one dare or presume to reject it on any grounds*” (D 1506).

The motives for this decree were: a) that unity might be had in the multitude of the versions of the sacred books which were being circulated; b) that the Council would protect the tradition of the Church and the ancient praxis of reading and using the Vulgate, contrary to the Protestants who rejected or even contemned it.

151. This decree, as it is generally explained, is *formally disciplinary*, not *dogmatic*.²

For, *from an examination of the decree* it is certain 1) *that the decree is looking at practical things and agendas*, not merely theoretical: namely a)

1. Besides the authors praised above, R. Criado, S.J., more recently, treated the history of these declarations and the later interpretation of theologians, *El Concilio de Trento y los estudios biblicos*: RazFe 131 (1945) 172-180; S. Muñoz Iglesias, *El decreto tridentino sobre la Vulgata y su interpretación por los teólogos del siglo XVI* [especially related to the process “Fray Luis de León”]: EstBibl 5 (1946) 137-169. On the value of the Tridentine decree see also the *Letter of the Pontifical Biblical Commission on the Bible* (August 20, 1941) n.2 (EB 526); and “*Divino afflante Spiritu*” (EB 549; D 3825).
2. *Certain older authors* thought that it is dogmatic.

to the *usefulness* to be gained against *abuses* occurring from the diversity of versions³; b) the statute is restricted to *public* readings... (why is it not also extended to private reading, if the decree is dogmatic?); c) it is decreed that no one *should dare to reject it*.

2) The custom of the Council was that, in the individual matters successively, both dogmatic questions and questions of disciplinary reform would be treated, but before indirectly, in decreeing the canon of the sacred books "as they are being read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate editions," the dogmatic decree had been made.

However, this second decree *can be said to be dogmatic*, inasmuch as it has its foundation in the preceding dogmatic decree; and also *inasmuch as from it some dogmatic consequences are inferred*, which will be explained below.

152. Therefore in this decree the Council is treating *public and juridical authenticity*, which has been affirmed for the Vulgate, that is, which can be used for argumentation and to demand faith in public readings, disputations and sermons... But this *supposes the internal authenticity of conformity*; and it is *a positive privilege granted to the Vulgate*, so that no one should dare or presume to reject it. The other translations are left in their own prior condition and nothing is said about them.

153. *The right of the Church to make this decree.* In virtue of her mission the Church has the right and the duty of guarding and proposing infallibly the word of God; and this word or revelation is contained not only in the traditions, but also in the sacred and canonical books. Therefore the Church evidently has the right of defining the canon and infallibly declaring whether what is shown in the editions as the word of God really is such or has the authenticity of conformity.

The Church, therefore, is infallible in this dogmatic fact; otherwise the guardianship of the written word of God and its correct exposition would turn out to be impossible.

154. The doctrinal (dogmatic) inferences from this decree.

1) *The Vulgate cannot have any errors regarding faith and morals.* For: a) *since for many centuries it has been approved by its use in the Church*, God could not permit that it be contaminated with dogmatic and moral evils; such defilement certainly would redound against the infallibility of the Church teaching and entrusting to the faithful this version and of the

3. See the last summary of abuses in the *Council of Trent* (Goerres) 5,29.

Church learning by the use of this version.

b) Since the Tridentine decree is *disciplinary for the whole Church*, the infallibility of the Church in making this decree is certain.

c) That there are no errors of faith and morals in the Vulgate *is indicated in the preceding decree*, as the sources are known “in strengthening its teachings and renewing morals in the Church” (D 1505). And in this decree (D 1506) the Vulgate is declared to be authentic for public readings, disputations, sermons... in which matters of faith and morals are wont to be treated.⁴

155. 2) *The Vulgate has at least substantial conformity with the original text.* For if the Vulgate is declared to be authentic, therefore this is because it has internal authenticity of conformity; and this, even if not in some accidentals, must be present at least in the substantials.

Moreover, there would be no little harm for the Church, if at least this substantial conformity were not present. For then the Latin Church for a long time and for many centuries would have been deceived with regard to the substance itself of the written word of God. And then it would be said undeservedly in the dogmatic canon on the Scriptures that all the books must be received with all their parts as sacred and canonical “as they are being read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate editions” (D 1504).

156. Hence it follows: a) in the Vulgate there are all and only the sacred books; b) the totality of the sentences, or the Vulgate *as a whole*, which has been preserved by the Church for so many centuries, is the same and contains the same things as the totality of sentences of the original texts.

But not only the totality of the sentences of the Vulgate, or the Vulgate taken as a whole, was contained in the original texts of Scripture. Also the *individual dogmatic texts of the Vulgate*, that is, the texts dealing with faith and morals, if they were preserved by the Church for so many centuries, *as to their content were not lacking in the autographs*; and also—as it seems—the *definite text of the Vulgate*, preserved by the long use of the Church, *does not express any dogma other than the corresponding text of the autograph*.

For the end or purpose of the first declaration of the Tridentine Council concerning the authenticity of the Vulgate (D 1504-1505), that is, the end of the indirect declaration of this authenticity, was to have the testimonies

4. Also the presiding legates at the Council said that “the ancient vulgate edition has never been suspected of heresy...”, *the Council of Trent* 5,519,19f.; see 470,30f.

and supports it will use in strengthening its teachings and renewing morals in the Church (*ibid.*); but for this it decreed that the canonical books, which it enumerated, must be accepted *as sacred and canonical*, "in their entirety, with all their parts, *as they are being read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the ancient Latin Vulgate editions.*" Therefore this declaration of Trent intended to prove that, by using the Vulgate as it was customarily read in the Church, anyone would have and the Council would have the supports and dogmatic texts *as the written word of God*. But this would not be the case, if a dogmatic text of the Vulgate, which was critically preserved in the Church for many centuries, were not found in the original; or also if it were to express something substantially different from the corresponding text of the autograph.⁵

157. The same point seems to be made by the second, direct declaration of the authenticity of the Vulgate (D 1506); for, if the Vulgate can be used authentically in public readings, disputations, sermons and expositions, then that is because it contains authentically *the written word of God*, for matters of faith and morals, which is clear from the context of the twofold declaration of authenticity; and therefore an appeal to the dogmatic text of the Vulgate is an appeal to the written word of God.

158. However, please not that this applies not to just any text of the Vulgate; for 1) those that are *purely profane* and are not closely connected with the things pertaining to faith and morals (although they certainly are inspired, if they agree with the inspired original), are not declared authentic by the Council. 2) Those texts of the Vulgate, although they are dogmatic, about which there were critical doubts in the Church, and therefore *have not been preserved by the long use of the Church*—they also are not declared to be authentic. To these pertains 1 Cor. 15:51 which in Latin does not agree with the original Greek text; and also 1 John 5:7 (the famous Johannine

5. See Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁴ p.494ff.: "... if the testimonies, as they are given in the old Vulgate edition, do not express the dogma at least according to its meaning, they would not be in conformity with the original Scripture, and they would not be divine and canonical testimonies. Therefore all the testimonies in the old Vulgate edition, which are expressly *per se dogmatic*, were declared by the Council to be in conformity with the original Scripture according to the meaning; that is, in all these matters that translation must be held to be authentic in virtue of the decree of the Council" (*ibid.*, p.495). And again: "... among the many old authors whom I consulted, so far I have found no one who expressly said or indicated, in virtue of the decree, that the authenticity of the Vulgate is not determined in the texts of this kind that are *per se dogmatic*. And in such a grave matter one must not depart from the common doctrine and interpretation" (Franzelin, *ibid.*, p.496). However, see E. Mangenot, who, when he reviewed various theologians treating the substantial conformity of the Vulgate with the originals, added: "Toutefois ces théologiens ne sont pas d'accord au sujet de l'étendue de la conformité de la Vulgate avec les textes originaux, et il ya en ces matières une part d'appréciation qui tient plus ou moins compte des faits et de la critique du texte." *Vulgate*: DB 5,2490.

comma), which does not seem to have been in the original text.⁶

From the declaration of the authenticity of the Vulgate greater force is not being attributed to texts previously considered to be doubtful from a critical point of view; for, the Vulgate is to be preferred or declared to be authentic only insofar as it has been preserved for long time in the use of the Church.

159. 3) But if the agreement is affirmed between the dogmatic texts of the Vulgate and the original, *still a modal discrepancy of the Vulgate with the autographs does not seem to be excluded*; for, a complete agreement of the version with the original text *per se is not required* in order that a version rightly may be said to be substantially authentic; and moreover the comparison itself of the Vulgate with the original texts often shows that there is this difference and discrepancy, or also a comparison between the Vulgate and other translations.

This discrepancy, *called modal*, can be either regarding the more or less clarity with which the truth is proposed, or also that the same dogma is handed on under a different aspect and formal reason. The classical example is that of Gen. 3:15, where the Vulgate has *she will crush your head*, while according to the TM and according to the LXX it says *he (he who is the seed of the woman)...*; therefore one text expresses directly the triumph of the woman, but the other text expresses directly the triumph of the seed of the woman; but there is really no opposition, because truly *she triumphed through her Son and because of her Son*.⁷

160. 4) *In the Tridentine decree it is not said that not even the smallest accidental error is found in the Vulgate.* Such errors would be, not indeed in matters of faith and morals, but in other purely historical or purely scientific things, like chronology, the names of plants, and so forth.

The Fathers at the Council acknowledged these errors in the Vulgate; for, when the decree was sent to Rome for approval, the Roman theologians objected that "it seems to be surprising that the Vulgate is not allowed to

6. On this Johannine comma, see A. Lemonnyer, *Comma Johanneum*: DB 2,67-73; Simón-Prado, *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1938) n.933-935; T. Ayuso, *Nuevo estudio sobre el "Comma Ioanneum"*: Bibl 28 (1947) 83-112, 216-235; 29 (1948) 52-76.

7. There are those who hold that sometimes there is *more than a modal* difference between the text of the Vulgate and the originals, or between the version of the LXX and the Vulgate; and at times a difficulty appears of reconciling the Vulgate with other texts equally authentic, which seem to approach the original (see A. Durand, *Vulgate latine*: DAFC 4,1978 g). But again it helps to note that we are dealing with the texts of the Vulgate which have been preserved in the use of the Church for a long time, and therefore which were not critically doubtful from a known diversity with the LXX and with other readings; and also that the *contemporary* state of the TM or LXX, or of other versions, is *not a definitive argument* for the truth of the original text.

be rejected in those places in which the common sense of the Hebrew text and of the LXX does not agree with the Vulgate or it is not well expressed in the Latin translation,” and that these differences cannot be attributed to the amanuenses alone or to the typographers.⁸ The legates responded, *not by denying that*, but, by insisting on the things that pertain to faith and morals, “*that the old and vulgate edition was never suspected of heresy, and that this is the most important in the sacred books*; and in accordance as the better Greek and Hebrew texts are used in that same way they prove the reading of the Vulgate, as anyone can see; and *with regard to the other passages in the Vulgate, which may seem to be obscure, inept, barbarous, scarcely intelligible*, no one is prevented from explaining and illustrating them whether with interpretations or annotations, *or also with a new translation....*”⁹

Therefore the intention was not to vindicate for the Vulgate the fullest authenticity of conformity in the things that do not pertain to faith and to morals. It should also be added that *the purpose of the Council* in declaring the authenticity of the Vulgate was to have the support and assistance in confirming dogmas and renewing morals, and therefore not for profane things; wherefore *in the Vulgate profane things are not declared to be authentic*.

And this was always the certain opinion of eminent theologians, *like Andreas Vega, Aloysius Legionensis, Arias Montano, Ioannes Mariana, Láinez, Salmerón, St. Robert Bellarmine...*, but there were others who denied it.¹⁰

161. You will object: 1) the decree which is said to have been given on January 17, 1576, by the Congregation of Cardinals, interpreters of the Tridentine Council, “thought that nothing could be said which is opposed to the Vulgate edition, even if it would be only a period, a single clause,

8. *Concilium Tridentinum* 10,507,23-30; and also before, *ibid.*, 462,12-16.

9. *Concilium Tridentinum* 10,519,19-26; see *ibid.*, 470,30f.

10. Consider what Ioannes Morin wrote: “... I think that St. Jerome composed that version under the special inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and that it was free from all error because of the direction and movement of the same Spirit; and none of the obscurities and ambiguities of the original text, or any errors that had crept into the Hebrew text, or any errors that had invaded the Greek and the Latin, were corrected by him when he compared the ancient translation of the New Testament with the Greek, so he could not be deceived into committing any error, even the slightest, in his translation. Therefore, even though sometimes he follows a reading different from the Septuagint interpreters, the Holy Spirit authorized both canons through both interpreters... Hence it follows that the vulgate version according to all of its parts per se and by its own nature is true and is independent of every approbation and decree of the Church, since it derives its origin from a divinely inspired author...” *Exercitationes Biblicae* (Paris 1660) (in epist. dedicatoria) l.1 exercitatio 6 c12 p.156. Other names of those denying and also of those affirming have been assembled by R. Criado: *RaxFe* 131 (1945) 178; concerning “Fr. Luis de León,” S. Muñoz: *EstBibl* 5 (1946) 148ff.

or a part, whether a word, or only a saying, or a syllable or one iota.”¹¹ *Response*. Even after admitting the authenticity of this apparent decree, a) the Congregation did not have infallible authority; b) from the response given in the year 1859 by Pius IX while giving his approval by a vocal declaration, this decree should be understood “to forbid lest anything should be asserted opposed to the Vulgate edition in matters of faith and morals.”¹²

You will say 2) according to the Council “let no one dare or presume to reject it [the Vulgate] on any grounds” (D1506). *Response*. In matters of faith and morals, and inasmuch as it has been preserved by the Church for so many centuries (D 1506).

162. 5) *In the Tridentine decree the original text is not rejected, nor the other more ancient version;* but both the Hebrew text and the Greek LXX, and the more ancient versions, are left in their prior condition. Nor is the Vulgate said to be preferred to the original text or to the more ancient versions.

For, from the history of the Tridentine decree it is certain that the Fathers wanted to declare the authentic Vulgate “but not by detracting from the authority of the pure and true interpretation of the translators of the Septuagint, which the Apostles used sometimes, nor by rejecting other editions, inasmuch as they offer help for the understanding of the authentic text.”¹³ And the words of the Cardinal Legates agree on that same point: “by the approval of the Latin Vulgate the other versions are not condemned, which are Catholic and offer assistance for understanding it, which alone must be declared to be authentic; but the others that are not named are left in their prior condition.”¹⁴

See on this whole matter “*Divino afflante Spiritu*” (D 3825; EB 549).

163. And it does not seem to be repugnant that some text, which was in the original, is not now in the Vulgate, not indeed something of great importance, but rather in minor matters, v.gr., regarding chronologies, genealogies, names of plants, names pertaining to history...; and also, according to St. Jerome,¹⁵ some things were missing in the first and second centuries in the authentic versions which Christians had at that time,

11. In Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁴ p.519.

12. *Ibid.*, p.519. See also E. Mangelot, *Vulgate*: DB 5,2488.

13. *Concilium Tridentinum* 5,29,10-14. And the request of Cardinal Pacheco that the version of the LXX be rejected was not agreed to.

14. *Ibid.*, 10,471,1-3.

15. See St. Jerome, *Epist.* 112 (to Augustine) 20: ML 22,928; *Praefatio in Pentateuchum*: ML 28,179ff...; Cornely, *Introductionis Compendium*¹⁰ n.99 c.

regarding the messianic prophecies, in the old Latin translations and in the LXX. For, it is not repugnant that some things are obscure from the original text or even are lost, if you distinguish carefully between the permanent end and the temporal end of Holy Scripture; and those things should not be thought to pertain to the deposit of faith, which are not necessary for the permanent and common end of these sacred books, if, that is, the text is not dealing with thoughts that are per se revealed (on this matter see n.121,23).¹⁶

164. "Wherefore this authority of the Vulgate in matters of doctrine by no means prevents—indeed, rather, today it almost demands—either the corroboration and confirmation of this same doctrine by the original texts or the having recourse on any and every occasion to aid of these same texts, by which the correct meaning of the Sacred Letters is everywhere daily made more clear and evident. Nor is it forbidden by the decree of the Council of Trent to make translations into the common tongue, even directly from the original texts themselves, for the use and benefit of the faithful and for the better understanding of the divine word, as we know to have been already done in a laudable manner in many countries with the approval of the ecclesiastical authority."¹⁷

165. 6) *The Vulgate, which has been preserved by the Church for so many centuries, can be used to make safely a dogmatic argument:* An argument will then be *scriptural*, if it is established that the text of the Vulgate is critically conformed to the original, or at least if the constant use of this text in the Church, as the text from Scripture, can be proved; for otherwise it would be an interpolation into the written word of God, and the Church would have handed on some truth as falsely pertaining to the written word of God, and the Magisterium of the Church would have erred in this matter. But if some text of the contemporary Vulgate does not seem to have been present in the original text, but is critically dubious (like the Johannine comma: 1 John 5:7), then it can be used as an argument from

16. "... however it is not excluded that a dogma expressed in the original Scripture perhaps is lacking in the Vulgate edition," Franzelin, *De divina Traditione et Scriptura*⁴ p.491. See above, n.56, 2 and n.121,23.

17. "*Divino afflante Spiritu*" (EB 549; D 3825). In addition to this, concerning the mind of the Church on the use of the versions of Holy Scripture in the vernacular languages, there is a *decree of the Biblical Commission* (April 30, 1934): it is not allowed publicly in the churches to read to the people liturgical passages (epistles and Gospels) according to versions that are not taken from the old Latin Vulgate, that is, from the original texts whether Greek or Hebrew (EB 520). But in order to explain this decree better there is another *Response* given on August 22, 1943, in which the versions legitimately made in the vernacular languages are recommended, and it is said that the liturgical text of the Vulgate can be illustrated with the help of the original text or of some other clearer version, after the reading of the liturgical text itself (EB 535-537).

tradition, since it has been preserved by the Church for so many centuries.

But if the original words are ambiguous, an argument can be made from the Latin words alone of the Vulgate; on the other hand, if the meaning of the Vulgate is ambiguous, then it should be explained from the original.

On the authenticity of other texts

166. Concerning the Greek translation of the LXX,¹⁸ the translators were not inspired and they knew that¹⁹; but that translation *has public authority*. For

a) The Apostles often cite the Old Testament from the LXX, even when the Hebrew text disagrees; and probably they transmitted that version of the LXX to the Hellenist, extra-Palestinian churches.

b) The Greek church remained united in the possession of this version; and, besides the Greek Church, other oriental churches used this version, even the Latin church until the 7th century.

c) Sixtus V in the *Vatican* edition of the LXX, made by his authority (1586), decreed in the introductory *Letter* "that the Old Testament according to the Septuagint, now revised and corrected, is to be received and retained by all."²⁰

Critically the state of the LXX translation today is not so good, as we said about the N.T. (*On Revelation* n.329); doubtless this is because of the studies which have been made of comparing it with the Hebrew text; hence several different readings and variations occur, which increase the difficulty of restoring the good primitive reading. But even this primitive reading more often probably can be detected.

167. The Greek text of the New Testament has not been solemnly approved; but certainly *it is approved indirectly*, because the whole Greek church uses this text.

But *its internal conformity and certitude are very great, and therefore authentic*, by which present-day critics are able to restore substantially the primitive text, even with regard to many accidental points.²¹

18. See *Instit. biblicae* 1^o l.3 n.135.

19. See St. Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 18,43: ML 41,604; Cornely, *Introductionis Compendium*¹⁰ n.77.

20. On the edition of the LXX by Sixtus V, see A Vaccari, *Sixtus V eiusque in S. Scripturam curae*: VerDom 2 (1922) 369-374. Whether the Bull "Aeternus ille" of Sixtus V, in which the authenticity of the edition of the LXX was said to have been made by him, was properly published so that it would obtain full juridical force, is doubtful: see A. Durand, *Vulgate latine*: DAFC 4,1977.

21. See above *On Revelation* n.329. S. Tromp treats the *De revisione textus N.T. facta Romae a Commissione pontificia circa a. 1617 praeside S.R. Bellarmino*: Bibl 22 (1941) 303-306.

168. The Hebrew text has a *critically proved internal authenticity*; but the Church does not use it in the liturgies and in the definitions, etc.; and it does not have the solemn approval of the Church, unless this is presupposed because the Vulgate agrees with it.

The TM has come to us *substantially* incorrupt.²² It is extraordinary that in such a number and in such variety of codices the surviving copies are so much in agreement; that is surely an argument for the great solicitude and faithful concern in transcribing them.

Before Christ the text was not corrupt. For, Christ or the Apostles never make such an objection to their adversaries, but fully supposed the authenticity of the text then in use.

Furthermore, since the TM agrees substantially with the Vulgate, if the latter is considered authentic, then the former text *must be held to be authentic*.²³

22. See *Instit. biblicae* 1^o1.3 n.132f.

23. I.M. Vosté treats *De revisione Bibliae Hebraicae iuxta votum Concilii Tridentini*: Ang 18 (1941) 387-394.

ARTICLE VII

ON THE INERRANCY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

Suarez, *De fide* d.5 s.3 ("Whether Holy Scripture is the rule of faith"); E. Mangelot, *Inspiration de la Bible*: DTC 7,2207-2266; A. Durand, *Inerrance biblique*: DAFC 2,752-787; Pesch, *De inspiratione* 1.2 c.4; Bea, *De inspiratione* n.73-98; A. Fernández, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.47-85; A. Merk-A. Bea, *ibid.*, 1.1 n.88-98; Bainvel, *De Scriptura sacra* p.144-158; Höpfl-Gut, *Introductio generalis* n.121-182.¹

169. Now we are going to speak about the most important effect of inspiration, namely, the inerrancy of Holy Scripture. And the different theories devised in order to explain this inerrancy will have to be considered, namely, those that have recently been proposed to solve the so-called *biblical question*.

Thesis 8. All the sentences of Scripture are infallibly true.

170. Definition of terms. *Infallibility* says not only an absence of error, but *the impossibility of error* in an intelligent subject, or in his words or writings. Therefore the infallibility of all the sentences of Holy Scripture says not only the fact of their truth (*inerrancy*), but the impossibility of any error. Therefore the question is not only about the fact, but also about the right: there cannot be any errors.

State of the question. The *original* sentences of Holy Scripture, that is, the autographs, are under consideration. The inerrancy of the apographs and translations is affirmed inasmuch as they are in agreement with the original text. Therefore the possibility of some error is not denied, if the original text has not been transmitted to us; this of course is not to be denied in some matters of less importance. Therefore sometimes there are different readings or the introduction of possible *glosses* (see D 3397; EB 184 [177]).

171. Adversaries. Erasmus admitted that there could be present in Holy Scripture slight errors, especially because of the memory lapse of the authors.²

Rationalists and Modernists, not admitting the fact of inspiration, say that the sacred books, since they have a natural origin, are fallible.

1. *Doctrina Sancti Thomae de inerrantia biblica* is treated by M. Sales, O.P.: DivThom (pi) 3,1 (19240 84-106; and in Xenia Thomistica 2 (1925) 24-26.

2. In ch. 2 and ch. 27 of Matt.; see Bellarmine, *De verbo Dei* 1.1 c.6 n.17-21; DTC 7,2224f.

Many modern Protestants attack the inerrancy of Holy Scripture.³

Some more recent authors designated in the *Encyclical "Humani generis,"* who "put forward the opinion, already often condemned, that asserts that immunity from error extends only to those parts of the Bible that treat of God or of moral and religious matters. They even wrongly speak of a human sense of the Scriptures, beneath which a divine sense, which they say is the only infallible meaning, lies hidden" (D 3887; EB 612).

172. Doctrine of the Church. It was solemnly defined at *Vatican Council I* (D 3029) that the inspiration of Scripture, and *implicitly its inerrancy and infallibility*, extends to matters of faith and morals and to the parts that are at least of greater importance. See n.111.

Clement VI taught that there is absolutely no error in Scripture, writing (in 1351) about the errors of the Armenians: We ask "Whether you have believed and do believe that the New and Old Testaments in all their books, which the authority of the Roman Church has given to us, contain undoubted truth in all things" (D 1065; EB 46 [31]).

And for certain the same thing is proposed by the ordinary Magisterium of the Church as a *dogma of faith*. Thus Leo XIII ("*Providentissimus*"): "... and so far is it from being possible that any error can co-exist with inspiration, that inspiration not only is essentially incompatible with error, but excludes and rejects it as absolutely and necessarily as it is impossible that God himself, the supreme Truth, can utter that which is not true. This is *the ancient and unchanging faith of the Church...*" (D 3292; EB 124f. [109f.]).

Likewise Benedict XV ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": D 3652; EB 452 [465]) and Pius XII ("*Divino afflante Spiritu*": EB 538-540; and "*Humani generis*": D 3887; EB 612).

See also the condemnations of the Modernists in the *Decree "Lamentabili"* (D 3411; EB 202 [195]), and in the *Encyclical "Pascendi"* (EB 279-281 [272-274]); and the Response of the Biblical Commission (in 1915), on the mind of the Apostles concerning the *Parousia* (D 3628; EB 419 [432]).

173. Theological note. From what has been said it is certain that the thesis is of *divine and Catholic faith*. See also D 3629, EB 420 [433], where the Commission speaks about "*the Catholic dogma* regarding the inspiration and inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures...."

3. See Bea, *De inspiratione* n.73 in the note.

174. It is proved from Scripture. *Christ and the Apostles*, when they cite Holy Scripture under the formula "it is written" or with similar words, quote the words as having absolute authority, to which error is wholly repugnant (v.gr., John 10:35; Luke 24:44; and below n.181). Therefore they consider the words of Holy Scripture as infallibly true.

It is proved from tradition. Moreover, *the constant and universal, perpetual and universal tradition* holds absolutely that there is no error in Scripture nor is it even possible; this is proposed as a dogma of faith.

"And so emphatically were all the Fathers and Doctors agreed upon the divine writings, as left by the biographers, that they are free from all error that they labored earnestly..., with no less skill than reverence, *to reconcile with each other those numerous passages that seem at variance*, for they were unanimous in laying it down that those writings in their entirety and in all their parts were equally of divine inspiration and that God himself, speaking through the sacred writers, could not set down anything but what was true" ("*Providentissimus*": D 3293; EB 127 [112]).

"Jerome further shows that the immunity of Scripture from error or deception is necessarily bound up with its divine inspiration and supreme authority. He says he had learned this in the most celebrated schools, whether of East or West, *and that it was taught him as the doctrine of the Fathers*, and generally received... Therefore [according to St. Jerome whose teaching is explained in the Letter "*Spiritus Paraclitus*"] 'Scripture cannot lie,'⁴ and it is wrong to say Scripture lies⁵; it is impious even to admit the very notion of error where the Bible is concerned⁶...."

St. Clement of Rome said the same thing.⁷ St. Justin: "*But I shall not venture to say such a thing* [that the Scriptures err]... since I am entirely convinced that no Scripture contradicts another, I shall admit rather that I do not understand what is recorded...."⁸ St. Irenaeus: "If, however, we cannot discover explanations of all those things in Scripture which are made the subject of investigation, yet let us not on that account seek after any other God besides Him who really exists. For this is the very greatest impiety...."⁹ Likewise St. Hippolytus,¹⁰ St. Epiphanius¹¹; again St. Jerome,¹² and St. Augustine: "I think *it is extremely dangerous to admit that anything in the sacred books should be a lie...*"¹³; and the same Augustine: "It is from those books alone of the Scriptures, which are now called canonical, that I have learned to pay them such honor and respect as to

4. *In Ier* 35:35f.: ML 24,885 A.

5. *In Nah* 1:9: ML 25,1238 C.

6. *Epist.* 57 (to Pammachius) 7,4: ML 22,573.

7. *Ad Cor* 1,45,2: R 22.

8. *Dialog. Cum Tryphone* 65: R 138.

9. *Adversus haereses* 2,28,2: R 203.

10. *In Daniele* 4,6: R 390 a.

11. *Adversus haereses Panarium* 70,7: R 1106.

12. *Epist.* 27 (to Marcella) 1: R 1347.

13. *Epist.* 28 (to Jerome) 3,3: R 1417.

believe most firmly that not one of their authors has erred in writing anything at all. If I do find anything in those books which seems contrary to truth, I decide that either the text is corrupt, or the translator did not follow what was really said, or that I failed to understand it"¹⁴; and elsewhere: "If we are perplexed by an apparent contradiction in Scripture, it is not allowable to say, 'The author of this book is mistaken'; but either the manuscript is faulty, or the translation is wrong, or you have not understood... But in consequence of the distinctive eminence of the sacred writings, *we are bound to receive as true whatever the canon shows to have been said...*"¹⁵

Therefore the Fathers propose this inerrancy and infallibility in such a way that *they say it must necessarily be held* both for the defense of dogmas and for the Christian life...; therefore they are not acting as mere private teachers.

And *Loisy* openly admits this consensus of the Fathers: "If we proceed from the data of tradition, there is no place for error in the Bible."¹⁶

Theological reasoning. *The inerrancy and infallibility of Scripture can also be proved as the unveiling of the concept concerning the extension of inspiration* to all the sentences of Scripture, or as consequences from it. For, if all the original or authentic sentences of Scripture are inspired, even things said in passing (*obiter dicta*), they are all the word of God. But falsity is opposed absolutely to the word of God. Therefore all the sentences of Scripture are infallibly true.

14. *Epist.* 82 (to Jerome) 1,3: R 1421; D 3293; EB 127 [112].

15. *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* 11,5: R 1597. See also *De consensu evangelistarum* 2,21,51: R 1612.

16. *Etudes bibliques*³ (1905) 145; Bea, *De inspiratione* n.75.

ON THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH OF HOLY SCRIPTURE AND ON THE LITERARY FORMS

175. After the *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* there were controversies about the way of interpreting the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, because of the difficulties which were thought to come from the physical, natural and historical sciences. Some explained the matter traditionally, other *liberally*. Thus we have what is called the *liberal school*.¹

Absolute truth is said inasmuch as it is opposed to *relative truth*. For, there were those who did not deny to Scripture truth and inerrancy, but *only relative*. They explained this in various ways.²

176. The different opinions. 1) A. Loisy, a modernist, distinguished between the religious truth only (what Scripture want to teach) and *economic truth* (that is, the clothing in which religious truth is expounded). This economic truth has a relative value. Indeed, according to the false teachings of Modernism, religious truth itself is not absolute, but changeable according to the circumstances of the times (D 3458; EB 249 [242]).

2) Others distinguished between the things that are *taught* and the things that are *simply asserted*; they said that the former constitute the primary element, but the latter constitute the secondary element of Scripture, and are not included in the intention of the hagiographer; therefore the truth, which is intended absolutely, is to be sought in the primary element.

Or they also spoke about the *apparently historical narrations*, which actually are fables or legends, or partly historical and partly non-historical, as if they have a garment of truth that does not have absolute value, but only relative.

For an example of such interpretations, see the way of conceiving the historicity of Gen. 1-3, as it is described in the Response of the Biblical Commission, June 30, 1909 (D 3513; EB 337 [333]).

J.M. Lagrange conceived the matter in this way³: Only those things are necessarily true in Scripture which *are taught* by the hagiographer, namely, those which are affirmed by him *categorically*, which is known *from the literary form*. Regarding the

1. On this name see EB 502 [515].

2. These theories were treated in the traditional sense, among others, by L. Murillo, S.J., *Crítica y Exégesis* 2nd edition (Madrid 1905); L. Fonck, S.J., *Der Kampf um die Wahrheit der hl.Schrift in den letzten 25 Jahren* (Innsbruck 1905); F. Egger, *Absolute und relative Wahrheit der hl.Schrift* (Brixen 1909); J. Linder, S.J., *Die absolute Wahrheit der h.Schrift nach der Lehre der Enz. Papst Benedikts XV "Spiritus Paraclitus"*; ZkathTh 46 (1922) 254-277; Ch. Pesch, especially in his *Supplementum*....

3. See *La méthode historique*² (1904). A comparison between the teachings of P.Lagrange and those of the *Encyclical "Divino afflante"* was proposed by E. Galbiati, *I generi letterari secondo il P. Lagrange e la "Divino afflante Spiritu"*: ScuolCatt 75 (1947) 177-186, 282-292.

narrations there is *primitive history*—a middle ground between fictitious history (a parable) and history in the proper sense; but in primitive history although there are material errors in a garment of truth, they are not formal errors, because that is not taught categorically by the hagiographer. Thus the narration about the destruction of Sodom, besides a historical nucleus of a certain big catastrophe, does not necessarily contain other things that are true.

D. Zannechia conceived this matter in a similar way⁴: In Scripture all things are true; *not absolutely, but relatively*, that is, in order to illustrate that whose confirmation is intended absolutely, i.e., with reference to religious and moral truths. Thus in the narration of Genesis about creation. There is a need of knowledge here to distinguish oriental poetry from the basic elements of an event....

3) Others spoke about *implicit citations*.⁵ Some are taken by the hagiographers in the sacred books from popular legends and sources, which in themselves are false; but inerrancy is saved, because *it is not the truth of the thing cited* that agrees with these things, which the hagiographer did not intend, *but the truth of the citation* (thus it was really said or narrated). For, there are *tacit or implied citations*, which now are not clearly known as such, because they could easily be known by their contemporaries as such citations, and because Hebrews did not have a way of handling indirect quotes. But the hagiographer did not make such citations his own, with regard to the truth of the quote, unless he explicitly or equivalently approved it.

An example of an implicit citation would be, v.gr., John 5:4 (having admitted the authenticity of the text): *For an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool, and troubled the water; whoever stepped in first after the troubling of the water was healed of whatever disease he had*: that is, the Apostle does not take responsibility with regard to the truth of the thing narrated, but is only reporting a popular saying.⁶

4) There were also those *who wanted to apply to history the principles about the apparent truth of the senses*, which Leo XIII mentioned regarding physical things (D 3287-3290; EB 121-123 [106-108]). Thus J.M. Lagrange, F. von Hummelauer, N. Peters.⁷

5) And, generally speaking, *different literary forms* have been determined, which have truth which is proper to them and relative: *fables or parables*, without any historical truth; *historical epics*, with a historical kernel only; *religious history*, to promote in some way religious edification; *ancient history*, or a narration according to the view of the people or according to a source found by chance; *popular tradition*, where some

4. See *Scriptor sacer sub divina inspiratione...* (Rome 1903).

5. Like F. Prat, *La Bible et l'histoire*⁵ (1908) 46-56.

6. See F. Prat, *Jésus Christ* I p.403.

7. On these authors, see Pesch, *Supplementum* p.29-32.

historical fact evolves with legends and fables; *a free narration....*⁸

177. Doctrine of the Church. 1) With regard to the condemnation of the relative truth of Scripture *in the sense of Modernism*, see D 3458 (EB 249 [242]); but we are not dealing in a special way with this matter.

2) That no distinction is to be made *between the religious element as primary and secondary* was taught by Benedict XV in the Encyclical "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (D 3652; EB 454f. [467f.]) and before him by Leo XIII ("*Providentissimus*": EB 124 [109]).

Likewise the *distinction between absolute and relative truth* for historical matters is rejected by Benedict XV ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": D 3653; EB 456 [469]).

The apparently historical narrations and the true historical nature of Holy Scripture were also treated by Benedict XV ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": D 3654; EB 461 [474]) and the Responses of the Biblical Commission: *in general* (D 3373; EB 161 [154]) and *on the three first chapters of Genesis* (D 3512-3519; EB 336-343 [332-339]).

Similarly *on denying in the hagiographers the expression of human views, in which error could be present* (D 3628-3630; EB 419-421 [432-434]).

3) *On not easily admitting implicit citations* was dealt with by the Responses of the Biblical Commission (D 3372; EB 160 [153]), the Encyclical "*Pascendi*" (D 3490-3491; EB 273 [266]) and the Encyclical "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (D 3654; EB 461 [474]).

4) *On not transferring to history the things which Leo XIII said about the apparent truth of the senses* was treated authentically by Benedict XV ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": D 3652f.; EB 454-458 [467-471]) and Pius XII ("*Divino afflante*": EB 539).

5) *On not admitting in the Bible a literary form that is opposed to the holiness and truth of God* is treated by the Encyclicals "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (D 3654; EB 461 [474]), "*Divino afflante*" (D 3829-3830; EB 559), and "*Humani generis*" (D 3899; EB 618; below, n.188).

178. Speaking in general, recently Pius XII, on the fiftieth anniversary of the Encyclical "*Providentissimus*," insists that all should religiously maintain the doctrine expounded with such gravity by Leo XIII and he also proposes and confirms it by his own authority ("*Divino afflante*": EB 538-540).

8. There is more about this especially in F. von Hummelauer, S.J., which he proposed for discussion in the book *Exegetisches zur Inspirationsfrage* (Freiburg im Br. 1904). On the literary forms, see Robert-Tricot, *Initiation biblique*² c.6; Bea, *Notae historicae...* (1947) p.42-48.

179. The doctrine of the Church has also been given with regard to particular sacred writings: *On the authenticity and substantial historicity of the Pentateuch*, although it is not necessary to hold that Moses wrote each and every thing by his own hand or dictated them to copyists; but that he used sources and afterwards approved minor changes in the text (D 3394-3397; EB 181-184 [174-177]). *On the historical truth of the Gospel of John* (D 3416-3418, 3398-3400; EB 207-209, 187-189 [200-202, 180-182]). *On the prophetic character and on the author of the book of Isaiah* (D 3505-3509; EB 291-295 [287-291]). *On the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis* (D 3512-3519; EB 336-343 [332-339]). *On the authors and on the time of composition of the Psalms* (D 3521-3528; EB 344-351 [340-347]). *On the synoptic Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles* (D 3561-3586; EB 318-411 [401-424]). *On the pastoral letters of St. Paul and the letter to the Hebrews* (D 3587-3593; EB 412-418 [425-431]).

180. But more recent is the letter of the Secretary of the Biblical Commission to Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris, according to which the following points are made⁹:

The preceding decrees and responses of the same Commission, *on the narrations only apparently historical* on June 23, 1905 (D 3373; EB 161 [154]), *on the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch* on June 27, 1906 (D 3394-3397; EB 181-184 [174-177]), *on the historical character of the first three chapters of Genesis* on June 30, 1909 (D 3512-3519; EB 336-343 [332-339]): *these directives in no way forbid the truly scientific examination of these problems* according to recent discoveries.

Concerning this *just freedom, within the limits of the traditional teaching of the Church*, the Sovereign Pontiff Pius XII said the following: "But this state of things is no reason why the Catholic commentator, inspired by an active and ardent love of his subject and sincerely devoted to Holy Mother Church, should in any way be deterred from grappling again and again with these difficult problems, hitherto unsolved, not only that he may refute the objections of the adversaries, but also may attempt to find a satisfactory solution, which will be in full accord with the doctrine of the Church, in particular with the traditional teaching regarding the inerrancy of Sacred Scripture, and which will at the same time satisfy the indubitable conclusion of profane sciences. Let all the other sons of the Church bear in mind that the efforts of these resolute laborers in the vineyard of the Lord should be judged not only with equity and justice, but also with the greatest charity; all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected" ("*Divino afflante*": EB 564). This is also again brought to mind in this letter.

9. Read this letter in AAS 40 (1948) 45-48; EB 577-581; D 3862-3864; see also A. Bea, *Il problema del Pentateuco e della storia primordiale*: CivCatt 99,2 (1948) 116-127; and J.M. Vosté, O.P., *El reciente document de la Pontificia Comisión Bíblica*: EstBibl 7 (1948) 133-145.

There is also *an invitation for the problematic study of the Pentateuch*, keeping in mind the healthy criticism and conclusions of the related sciences.

With regard to *the literary forms of the first eleven chapters of Genesis*, it is to be noted that "these literary forms do not correspond to any of our classical categories, nor can they be judged in the light of the Greek and Latin literary forms or of modern ones. Therefore, their historicity cannot be denied or affirmed, taken as a whole, without unduly applying to them norms of some literary form that does not pertain to them."¹⁰

But "*to declare a priori* [which before often happened] *that their narratives contain no history in the modern sense of the term, would easily convey the idea that they contain no history in any sense*, whereas they relate in simple and figurative language, adapted to the understanding of a less developed people, the fundamental truths presupposed for the economy of salvation as well as the popular description of the origin of the human race and of the chosen people."¹¹

And the *Encyclical "Humani generis"* said:

"In a particular way must be deplored a certain too free interpretation of the historical books of the Old Testament. Those who favor this system, in order to defend their cause, wrongly refer to the letter that was sent not long ago to the archbishop of Paris by the Pontifical Commission on Biblical Studies. This letter, in fact, clearly points out that the first eleven chapters of Genesis, although properly speaking not conforming to the historical method used by the best Greek and Latin writers or by competent authors of our time, do nevertheless pertain to history in a true sense, which, however, must be further studied and determined by exegetes; the same chapters [the letter points out], in simple and figurative language adapted to the mentality of a people but little cultured, both state the principal truths that are fundamental for our salvation and also give a

10. "The question of the literary forms of the first eleven chapters of Genesis is far more obscure and complex. These literary forms corresponds to none of our classical categories and cannot be judged in the light of Greco-Latin or modern literary genres. One can, therefore, neither deny nor affirm their historicity, taken as a whole, without unduly applying to them the canons of a literary genre within which it is impossible to classify them. If one agrees not to recognize in these chapters history in the classical and modern sense, one must also admit that the current scientific data do not allow giving a positive solution to all the problems they pose. The first duty here incumbent on scientific exegesis consists above all in the attentive study of all the literary, scientific, historical, cultural, and religious problems connected with these chapters; one should then examine closely the literary processes of the early Oriental peoples, their psychology, their way of expressing themselves, and their very notion of historical truth; in a word, one should collate without prejudice all the material from the palaeontological and historical epigraphic, and literary sciences. Only thus can we hope to look more clearly into the true nature of certain narratives in the first chapters of Genesis." AAS 40 (1948) 47; EB 581; D 3864.
11. "Déclarer a priori que leurs récits [of the first chapter of Genesis] ne contiennent pas de l'histoire au sens modern du mot, laisserait facilement entendre qu'ils n'en contiennent en aucun sens, tandis qu'ils relatent en un langage simple et figuré, adapté, aux intelligences d'une humanité moins développée, les vérités fondamentales presupposées à l'économie du salut, en même temps que la description populaire des origines du genre humain et du peuple élu. En attendant il faut pratiquer la patience qui est prudence et sagesse de la vie." AAS 40 (1948) 47; EB 581; D 3864.

popular description of the origin of the human race and the chosen people. If, however, the ancient sacred writers have taken anything from popular narrations (and this may be conceded), it must never be forgotten that they did so with the help of divine inspiration, through which they were rendered immune from any error in selecting and evaluating those documents" (D 3898; EB 618).

181. Notes for the solution of the "biblical question." In evaluating correctly this biblical question, so that we may proceed cautiously and at the same time skillfully, it will help to pay attention to the following points:

1) *Christ and the Apostles cite many things from Scripture as absolutely true*, even with regard to singular historical points, taken from those books, which some say do not contain critical history.

"Whether teaching or disputing He [Christ] quotes from all parts of Scripture and takes his examples from it. He quotes them as an argument which must be accepted. He refers without any discrimination of sources to the stories of Jonah and the Ninevites, of the Queen of Sheba and Solomon, of Elijah and Elisha, of David and of Noah, of Lot and the Sodomites, and even of Lot's wife" (see Matt. 12:3.39-42; Luke 17:26-29.32) ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": EB 463 [476]).

Similarly *St. Peter* speaks about Noah building the ark and about the flood (1 Pet. 3:20; 2 Pet. 2:5); on the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah and of Lot (2 Pet. 2:6-7).

St. Paul likewise speaks about the miraculous events in the exodus of the sons of Israel sojourning in Palestine (1 Cor. 10:1-10); and he narrates many wondrous things during the course of time which were done because of faith (Heb. 11:4-40).

182. 2) *The consensus of the Fathers and Theologians does not favor those* "who, if they are restrained within certain limits, so abuse right principles indeed that they cause the foundation of the truth of the Bible to totter, and undermine the Catholic doctrine handed down by the Fathers in common. Among these Fathers Jerome, if he were still alive, would surely hurl the sharpest weapons of his speech, because, neglecting the sense and judgment of the Church, they take too ready a refuge in such notions as 'implicit quotations' or 'pseudo-historical narratives,' or they claim that certain literary genres are found in the Holy Books that cannot be reconciled with the entire and perfect truth of God's word, or they speculate about origins of the Bible in such a way that would inevitably weaken—if not destroy—its authority" ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": EB 461 [474]; D 3654).

183. 3) *Regarding the theories mentioned above, it may also help to observe:*

A. *That the inerrancy of Scripture is not derived precisely from the purpose of the writer, only from that which he intended to teach; but it is derived from the nature of inspiration, from all the things that are asserted in virtue of this influx.*

B. *Sometimes a religious truth doubtless can be taught under the form of a fictitious narration or fashioned according to a parable (v.gr., Luke 10:30-37 on the good Samaritan); these indeed have a relative, not an absolute value. But that must be proved by solid arguments; and in this one must not proceed casually or rashly, but according to the tradition of the Church (D 3373; EB 161 [154]). In this matter one must be on his guard lest too much is conceded to merely apparent arguments, that is, to those that have not yet really been proved¹²; so that the confusion should not be introduced whereby someone does not know how to distinguish true narrations from fictitious ones, and no objective norm remains for such discernment.*

Sometimes the matter, even after having consulted the tradition of the Church, remains doubtful, as in the case of Hosea 1-3; and that should not seem to be surprising (see "*Divino afflante*": EB 563).¹³

184. In the sacred narrations, although they are not critical histories in our sense with that technical, scientific and methodical investigation of the sources which is used today, still many things could be known by natural talent and perception, and the sources could be known and investigated with the help both of writings and popular tradition, which was especially valued among oriental families. Moreover, it is certain that the same inquiry "has also shown the special preeminence of the people of Israel among all the other ancient nations of the East in their mode of compiling history, both by reason of its antiquity and by reason of the faithful record of the events; qualities that may well be attributed to the gift of divine inspiration and to the peculiar religious purpose of biblical history" ("*Divino afflante*": EB 558f.; D 3830).

12. "Some of these writers display not only extreme hostility, but the greatest unfairness; in their eyes a profane book or ancient document is accepted without hesitation, whilst the Scripture, if they only find in it a suspicion of error, is set down with the slightest possible discussion as quite untrustworthy": EB 123 [108]. "There have been objections without number perseveringly directed against the Scripture for many a long year, which have been proved to be futile and are now never heard of; and not infrequently interpretations have been placed on certain passages of Scripture (not belonging to the rule of faith or morals) which have been rectified by more careful investigations. As time goes on, mistaken views die and disappear; but *truth remains and grows stronger for ever and ever* [3 Esdr. 4:38]...." ("*Providentissimus*": EB 131 [116]). See also "*Divino afflante*": EB 562-566.

13. Regarding the state of the contemporary dispute, v.gr., relating to the book of Tobit, recently it was treated by J. Prado, C.SS.R., *La indole literaria del libro de Tobit*: Sefarad 7 (1947) 373-394.

185. And certainly many things were known and taken from *popular and family tradition*; but it was done with admirable *sobriety and simplicity* (which is very evident, if they are compared with the traditions of the Egyptians and Babylonians) together with great *sincerity*, which manifests the vices of their ancestors.

And although often the history given is *incomplete*, that is, it is *primarily religious*; still incomplete history is not false history.

It is surely true that, in order to make a correct judgment, *one must take into account the literary form*, in which those ancient oriental authors were wont to present things; artificial genealogies, narrations through levels and repetitions like concentric circles (v.gr., Gen. 1 and 5), vague quotations....¹⁴

186. C. *On the quotations contained in Scripture*, please note the following:

Some quotations are *explicit* (v.gr., Acts 17:28: *as even some of your poets have said...*; and Num. 21:14; 2 Sam. 1:18), in which is present the "truth of citation" and also the "truth of the thing cited," if the hagiographer expressly or explicitly says that it is true.

Whether or not there are also *implicit* citations, that is, those which are borrowed by the hagiographer from some source without expressly saying that he is quoting, and about which it must be thought that he does not want to take responsibility for them, but wants to leave them to the judgment of the readers (who at that time could well know that they are dealing with quotations): that will have to be judged prudently, if one recalls that this is a general norm of narration, that the author so long assumes responsibility for what is said as he does not indicate that he has doubts or suspends judgment about its truth; that is even more the case, if it has to do with a sacred Scripture, through which God wants to teach us his providence, something that would hardly be obtained if all sacred history were reduced to doubtful statements.

Therefore the sacred author must be thought to be speaking in his own name, *unless the contrary is proved for certain* (D 3372; EB 160 [153]).

In 2 Chron. 5:9; 8:8 there are citations from documents, because that expression "and they are there to this day" was not true at the time of the writing of the book; but these are explicit rather than implicit citations, because the sacred author often cites sources.

14. See "*Divino afflante*": EB 558-561; D 3829-3830.

187. D. *The solution from sensible appearance in astronomical matters*, which can be valid for physical matters, cannot be applied to history.

For, the way of speaking about astronomical matters according to sensible appearance is admitted by all, even by astronomers; thus one speaks about "the rising sun," about "fixed" stars, "of the first or second magnitude..."; and therefore no one says that the astronomers are in error: because *Physics is a science of phenomena*. But History is not about phenomena which appear constantly and about which men speak according to their appearance; rather, *History is about things that existed, according as they existed*.

It is not correct to invoke the words of Leo XIII in the *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* (D 3287-3290; EB 121-123 [106-108]), which, if they are read carefully, do not recommend a similar way of interpreting history according to appearance, but *a similar way of refuting the adversaries of historical truth*. The authentic interpretation of Benedict XV may also be consulted ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": EB 455-458 [468-471]) and that of Pius XII ("*Divino afflante*": EB 539).¹⁵

188. E. *In investigating the literary genres of the Orient* there is surely a wide area to cover. And it is absolutely necessary to investigate the literary genre in which a book or pericope was written, so that in this way the true mind of the author can be known. For the things said are understood in one way in an allegory or parable (v.gr., Judg. 9:8-15), or in an epic song (v.gr., Ps. 104), but they are understood in another way in a historical narrative.

Now all literary genres can be reconciled with inspiration, except those that are by nature immoral (as are some in classical poetry), or are used in such a way that they lead to error.

But a *myth*, understood as a *false religious fable*, v.gr., by personifying natural things (the fecundity of the earth, etc.) as if they were divine beings, is not a literary genre that can be reconciled with inspiration; but a myth *cited* in Holy Scripture or merely expressed as a *literary ornament* can be accepted as such, that is, as merely cited, or as purely metaphorical.

Fictitious narrations can also be admitted, provided that as such they can be known and that historical truth in the proper sense is not necessarily ascribed to these words of narration.¹⁶ Thus there is an *allegorical* way of speaking, as in the Cantic of Canticles, which is an allegorical song describing the love and mystical union between Yahweh and his people;

15. On this matter, see F. Asensio, S.J., *Los principios establecidos en la Enciclica "Providentissimus Deus" acerca de la descripción de los fenómenos naturales, ¿autorizan su extensión al relato de los hechos históricos según la doctrina de Leon XIII y de Benedicto XV?*: EstBibl 5 (1946) 245-270.

16. See Bea, *De inspiratione* n.89.94.

and it is true that diverse literary genres are found in Scripture, whether poetic or didactic or narrative, where fables are mixed together with the narration (Judg. 9:8-15).

“For of the modes of expression that, among ancient peoples, and especially those of the East, human language used to express its thought, none is excluded from the Sacred Books, provided the way of speaking adopted in no wise contradicts the holiness and truth of God, as, with his customary wisdom, the Angelic Doctor already observed in these words: ‘In Scripture divine things are presented to us in the manner that is in common use among men’”¹⁷ (*“Divino afflante”*: EB 559; D 3830).

“Therefore, whatever of the popular narrations have been inserted into the Sacred Scriptures must in no way be considered on a par with myths or other such things, which are more the product of an extravagant imagination than of that striving for truth and simplicity which in the Sacred Books, also of the Old Testament, is so apparent that our ancient writers must be admitted to be clearly superior to the ancient profane writers” (*“Humani generis”*: D 3899; EB 618).

189. *The criterion* for knowing a literary genre will be the external form which men are accustomed to use in the respective literary form, unless something else is proved *solidly*; also the *tradition of the Church* must be considered, if something universal is to be affirmed (see n.250-262). It is certain that the Canticle of Canticles, both from its internal construction and from tradition, is an allegorical song. However, it would be contrary to the dignity of God, if a book, which according to its external form *for centuries has been universally thought to be historical*, in the final analysis were found to contain only fictitious narrations.

190. Therefore, in conclusion, the study of the ancient literary genres *is certainly desired*, so that in many places in Scripture a correct and certain interpretation can be had.

191. Objections. 1. *Astronomical errors* are present in Scripture: v.gr., Gen. 1:16 (the sun and the moon are two great lights); Matt. 24:29 (stars fall from the sky); Josh. 10:13 (sun and moon stand still)....

Response. All of these cases are looking at *the sensible appearance*, which suffices for the truth of their sentences; and by speaking in this way no error is expressed.

2. There are errors *concerning natural and world history*: Lev. 11:6; Deut. 14:7 (the hare is said to chew the cud); Lev. 11:19 (the bat is listed among birds); Job 26:11 (the heavens rest on pillars); Ps. 136:6 (the earth is said to be spread out upon the waters); Matt. 13:32; Mar. 4:31 (the mustard seed is said to be the smallest of seeds).

Response. In these expressions there are no errors, because the meaning of the words and the sense of the sentence are to be derived from the circumstances; but here

17. *Comment. ad Heb* c.3 lect.4.

the sacred authors are not using scientific terminology, *rather they are speaking according to the popular opinion*, in the same way as we are accustomed to speak, but not always philosophically and scientifically; or they are speaking in a poetic way. And in this way of speaking no error is found. And, even if the contemporaries because of the prejudices and false ideas of the time may have thought internally in a false way about these matters, still such an error objectively is not expressed in the sacred books.

3. In Luke 2:33 Joseph is said to be *his father* (of Christ).

Response. Father, *as was thought*, as the same Luke says in 3:23.

4. Those called by Joseph who entered Egypt according to Acts 7:14 were *Seventy-five*; and according to Gen. 46:27 they were *seventy in all*. Therefore one of these sentences of Scripture is false.

Response. 1) In saying that Stephen is following the reading of the LXX which has 75, while the Vulgate says 70. Therefore one or other of the *readings* is false, *conceded*; we are dealing here with two original, contradictory sentences, *denied*.

2) St. Stephen in this matter (and in others of his sermon) could have erred subjectively, or speaking in a rhetorical way he expressed the some things less exactly: *I bypass that* (for, although he was full of the Holy Spirit, all the things he says in this sermon are not *explicitly approved*; and generally Catholic exegetes admit the possibility of these less than exact statements).¹⁸ But in no way is there an error in the statement of this error by Luke. See what St. Jerome says about this (in objection 14).

5. Matt. 27: 9f. quotes words as if they were from Jeremiah, but they are not found in this prophet.

Response. 1) Perhaps in the autograph it was not Jeremiah but Zechariah, where they are really found.

2) The words quoted by Matt. are found in Zech. 11:12f. where Zechariah was acting as a type of the Lord concerning his estimated worth; *and the words from Jer.* (18:2; 19:1.11; 32:6f.) *are added* by Matt. which speak about the *potter's field*...; according to the ancient way of quoting Scripture. Therefore, the evangelist is using sacred terms, in which God had foreseen and intended a type of the things done by Christ or connected with him.¹⁹

6. According to St. Augustine²⁰ and Leo XIII ("*Providentissimus*": D 3287-3288; EB 121 [106]), *the Spirit of God who spoke through the sacred writers did not wish to teach men things that are not related to salvation*. But profane history, not being religious, is no help for salvation. Therefore it is not an object of divine teaching through Scripture.

I distinguish the major. According to St. Augustine and Leo XIII, in the cited passages, the Spirit of God did not intend "to teach men these things (that is to say, the essential nature of the things of the visible universe),

18. See A. Boudou, *Verbum salutis* 7 (*Actes des Apôtres*) in Act 7:2-16; in ed.6 (1933) p.137; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.438; A. Durand, *Inerrance biblique*: DAFC 2,763.

19. See A. Durand, *Verbum salutis* 1 (*St. Matthew*) at this place; in ed.21 (19290 p.506f.

20. *De Gen. ad litt.* 2,9,20: ML 34,270.

things in no way profitable unto salvation," *conceded*; he did not intend to teach men things pertaining to profane history, *denied*.

7. But according to Leo XIII the hagiographer speaking about physical things "*went by what sensibly appeared*"...and indeed "*the principles here laid down will apply to cognate sciences and especially to history*" ("*Providentissimus*": D 3288-3290; EB 121-123 [106-108]). Therefore profane history in the Bible can have only the appearance of truth.

Response. According to Leo XIII the "principles here laid down will apply to cognate sciences and especially to history, that is, by refuting, *in a somewhat similar way the fallacies of the adversaries and defending the historical faith of Sacred Scripture from their attacks*"²¹, *conceded*; as if history, which deals with truth (not with phenomena, like physics), could have only apparent truth, *denied*.

8. Just as there are defects in the words and in the external form of Scripture, to which inspiration is extended, so there can be defects of truth in those sentences which are used as garments for a religious kernel, which is intended to be taught.

I deny the parity. The words and external form of an inspired book, notwithstanding the influx of inspiration on it, *pertain to the material part of the book*, which admits of defects which must be attributed to the deficient instruments used by God; but the sentences, even those that serve as clothing of the principal truth, *pertain to the formal part of the book*, which must have the truth proper to each literary genre; for, every author is responsible for every sentence of the book. Therefore it is repugnant that the written word of God would contain errors, although it does admit literary defects.

9. God has *condescension* in the Bible, according to St. John Chrysostom ("*Divino afflante*": EB 559; D 3829-3830). Therefore, it is not surprising if he willed to use popular, non-critical legends in composing the sacred books.

I distinguish the antecedent. God has *condescension with error*, *denied*; *with the exclusion of all error*, inasmuch as in his revelation to men he uses anthropomorphisms, theophanies, rhetorical figures and figures of speech, and he speaks according as things appear to the senses in physical things, *conceded*. *This condescension has a place with regard to the style and way of speaking*, not with regard to a certain abuse of popular legends, in which false things are mixed together with true things with no way of distinguishing one from the other.²²

10. In order to defend the inerrancy of Scripture the Fathers did not have such great difficulties as we have. Therefore their testimony about the inerrancy of Scripture is not valid.

Response. The Fathers had their own great difficulties; but they never solved them by saying that something was false; nor did they give in to *claims that were not yet fully proved*. Moreover, the testimony of the

21. Pius XII, "*Divino afflante*" (EB 539); see also "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (EB 458 [471]; D 3653).

22. On this matter, see F. Fabri, *La "condiscendenza" divina nell'ispirazione biblica secondo S. Giovanni Crisostomo*: Bibl 14 (1933) 330-347.

Fathers does not force us to accept their scientific interpretations, but it does to accept their way of acting with regard to Scripture as the word of God with absolute authority.

11. *Objector insists*: Things that do not pertain to faith and morals, like profane history, are not the object of the Magisterium of the Church and therefore not of the Fathers either. Therefore the profane history in the Bible is not the object of the ecclesiastical Magisterium and of the Fathers.

I distinguish the antecedent. Things that do not pertain to faith and morals are not at least the indirect object of the ecclesiastical Magisterium, *denied*; inasmuch as if they are badly explained they could contradict dogma, and therefore the Church has the right to exclude false interpretations (see n.239-242); but these things are not the *direct object* of the ecclesiastical Magisterium, *I subdistinguish*: those things as they are narrated taken materially, *I bypass that*; those things taken formally, inasmuch as they have the form of inspiration and are its object, *denied*. The Fathers and the Magisterium of the Church can bear witness, that narrated facts, although profane, are inspired; and inasmuch as such things are the object of the ecclesiastical Magisterium and of the Fathers, who bear witness that inspiration covers those sentences and that they are the word of God.

12. According to *St. Jerome* there are insoluble contradictions in the Bible: "But when I read this problem, I began silently to burn within myself, and immediately while paging through Genesis and Exodus I found passages in which things were written which seem to raise a question. And at first I thought, while comparing spiritual things with each other, that they were unanswerable like many other things...."²³

Response. In the Bible there are *objectively* contradictory sentences and insoluble difficulties, *denied*; according to *St. Jerome* there are *subjective* difficulties, and they are for some men insoluble, *conceded*.

13. The same *St. Jerome* said: "They did not say [the Septuagint] that Ananias was a prophet, that is, lest they seem to say he is a prophet who really is not a prophet; as if some things are said in the sacred scriptures according to the opinion of the time when the deeds were recorded, but not according to what the truth of the matter contained."²⁴

Response. Jerome here is not stating a general principle, but in a particular case he explains why Ananias is not called a prophet.

14. The same *Jerome*: "But this is generally to be observed, that whenever the holy Apostles, or apostolic men, speak to the people often they abuse these testimonies, which has already been divulged among the Gentiles...."²⁵

Response. *St. Jerome* is talking about the sermon of Stephen in Acts 7:14 where 75 souls are said to have entered Egypt; that is because Stephen and Luke used (from the interpretation of Jerome) the *reading* from the Vulgate version of the LXX. But the word "abuse" here is equivalent simply to "use."

15. Again *St. Jerome*: "It takes a long time to run through all the deeds of the Jews;

23. *Epist.* 36 (to Damasus) 10: ML 22,456.

24. *In Jer* 5,28,10: R 1409.

25. *Quaest. hebraicae* (in Gen. 46:27): ML 23,1053.

and to apply *the whole fable of Samson* to the mystery of the sun (for that is what his name means).²⁶

Response. This word “fable” has two meanings, and can be applied to true history according to the mind of the speaker. Therefore listen to how *Jerome* continues to talk in the same place: “I come to the books of Kings when at the time of the harvest, because of Samuel’s prayers, rain comes down from heaven and the rivers immediately are full; and David is anointed as King; and Nathan and Gad prophesied mysteries; when Elijah was carried aloft in a fiery chariot, and Elisha with a twofold gift of the Spirit raised the dead to life. *These and other things that were written about the saints, unless someone believed everything, he would not be able to believe in the God of the saints....*”

26. *Comment, in epist. ad Philem.*: ML 26.645.

C H A P T E R I I

On the interpretation of Holy Scripture

A. Fernández, *Instit. biblicae* 1^o l.4 part 1; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.543-564; Höpfl-Gut, *Introductio generalis* part 4 n.599-696; J. Prado, *Propedeutica biblica*⁶ l.3 n.205-265.

192. Hermeneutics (from ἐρμηνεύειν, to interpret) is the discipline, and at the same time the art and science, which hands on the norms of the correct interpretation of the sacred books.

In this interpretation there can be a great difficulty, coming not only from the diversity of language, time, morals, and remote places pertaining to the sacred books, but also proceeding from the material treated (religious, supernatural) and from its divine origin.

“On this head it must be observed,” said Leo XIII, “that in addition to the usual reasons which make ancient writings more or less difficult to understand, there are some which are peculiar to the Bible. For the language of the Bible is employed to express, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, many things which are beyond the power and scope of the reason of man—that is to say, divine mysteries and all that is related to them. There is sometimes in such passages a fullness and hidden depth of meaning which the letter hardly expresses and which the laws of interpretation hardly warrant. Moreover, the literal sense itself frequently admits other senses, adapted to illustrate dogma or to confirm morality. Wherefore it must be recognized that the sacred writings are wrapped in a certain religious obscurity, and that no one can enter into their interior without a guide¹; God so disposing, as the holy Fathers commonly teach, in order that men may investigate them with greater ardor and earnestness, and that what is attained with difficulty may sink more deeply into the mind and heart; and, most of all, that they may understand that God has delivered the Holy Scriptures to the Church, and that in reading and making use of his Word, they must follow the Church as their guide and teacher” (*Providentissimus*: EB 108 [93]).

193. The proper object of this discipline is the *sense* of Scripture.

The sense is the concept of the mind which someone expressed with his own word, while paying attention to the circumstances; v.gr., when someone uses the word “gallus,” depending on the circumstances he intends to signify either a man from a definite country (Gaul) or a definite

1. See St. Jerome, *Epist.* 53 al.103 (to Paulinus) 4: ML 22,343.

animal (a rooster).

But the *signification* is every idea that can be present in the words independently of the intention of the one speaking, as they can be found in dictionaries; v.gr., the word “colere” can have the meaning of the work of “agriculture,” and the action of “divine worship.”

Therefore, it will be the proper object of Hermeneutics to teach the general principles by which the sense of Sacred Scripture is to be determined in the individual places. But it will be the task of Exegesis to apply these general principles to particular cases.

194. The divisions of Hermeneutics. It is usually considered to have three parts: The first part treats in general the senses of Holy Scripture and is called *Noematics* [= understanding]. The second considers the way of finding the sense of Holy Scripture and it is called *Heuristics* [discovering]. The third, finally, studies the way of proposing the sense of Holy Scripture and is called *Prophoristics* [explaining].

A R T I C L E I

ON THE SENSE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE²

195. Divisions concerning the sense of Holy Scripture. Having explained the general notion of the *sense* of Holy Scripture, now its divisions and species are to be considered.

The literal sense is that which the words immediately signify.

The real or typical sense is that which the thing signified by the words in its turn signifies something else. Thus, v.gr., *the eating of the paschal lamb* by the Israelites is what is signified by the words of the narration in Exod. 12:46f. and Num. 9:12; but this matter, signified immediately by the words, in turn signifies something else, according to John 19:36; actually it refers to the sacrifice of the Lord on the Cross. The first usage pertains to the literal sense of the passage; the second one pertains to the real or typical sense. Similarly, *the exodus of the people of Israel from Egypt*, according to Hosea 11:1 typically signified the departure of the child Jesus from Egypt, according to Matt. 2:15: *Out of Egypt I have called my son*.

196. But some thing can be a type also *by reason of the way in which it is narrated in the sacred writings*. Thus, Melchizedek is a type of Christ, the

2. The teaching of St. Thomas is found especially in *Quodlib.* 7 q.6 a.14-16; I, q. 1, a. 10. On the typical sense, see E. Martínez, *El sentido típico en la sagrada Escritura*: MiscCom 2 (1944) 1-34.

eternal priest (Heb. 7:2f.), because he is introduced into Genesis *without father, without mother, without genealogy, and having neither a beginning of days nor an end to his life*; when, however in reality, Mechizedek had all of these things.

On these senses, see “*Divino afflante*” (EB 550-553; D 3826-3828).

197. Both senses, the literal and the real, can be divided into *historical*, if the argument refers to history or to an event; into *tropological or moral*, if it refers to morals; into *anagogic*, if it refers to the future life; into *prophetic*, if it looks to the future or to what must be believed.

Sometimes the literal sense is said to be *grammatical, historical, logical*, while the typical sense is said to be *real, spiritual, mystical, allegorical*.

198. Other divisions. Depending on the *criterion* by which the sense is determined, the sense can be *grammatical* (philological) and *logical*, according as it is determined by the grammar or by the logic of the context.

From the assent of the mind which it requires, the assent can be *certain, probable, doubtful*.

By reason of its truth, the sense can be *true or false*.

From the nature of the phrase or words, the sense can be *proper*, if the words are taken in the proper sense, or *transferred* (metaphorical), if the words are taken tropologically.

The metaphorical or tropological sense is also the literal sense; for, when someone speaks with a trope, the words themselves immediately signify something, that is to say, not what the words materially signifies, but that which is meant by the words; v.gr., when we speak about the “arm of God,” we intend to signify immediately his divine power.³

On the *fuller, consequent and accommodated* sense, see below n.218-224.

Thesis 9. In Holy Scripture the literal sense must be acknowledged.

199. The doctrine of the Church entirely supports the literal sense present in Holy Scripture. Thus, v.gr., the *Letter “Spiritus Paraclitus”* explains the teaching of St. Jerome about this matter; and he “urges us to consider the words themselves of Scripture very diligently, so that it is established for certain what the sacred author said... And then he teaches us to inquire into what signification and meaning there is in the words... Therefore, in the first place we must direct our mind to the literal and historical explanation...” (EB 485 [498]).

3. On this matter, see “*Providentissimus*”: EB 485 [498] at the end; and S.Th. I, q. 1, a. 10 ad 3.

Likewise Pius XII says that this is the task of the interpreter—to perceive and define the literal sense; in the *Letter “Divino afflante”* (EB 550; D 3826-3828).

And in the *Letter “Humani generis.”* Against the new opinions he defends “the literal sense of Holy Scripture and its explanation, carefully worked out under the Church’s vigilance by so many great exegetes... [which, according to their fictitious opinions] should yield now to a new exegesis, which they are pleased to call symbolic or spiritual. By means of this new exegesis of the Old Testament, which today in the Church is a sealed book, it would finally be thrown open to all the faithful. By this method, they say, all difficulties vanish, difficulties that hinder only those who adhere to the literal meaning of the Scriptures” (EB 613; D 3888).

200. Theological note. Since this matter is clearly contained in Holy Scripture, and the Magisterium of the Church thoroughly supports or teaches it, that is, the literal sense in the written word of God, the thesis must be said to be a matter of *divine and Catholic faith*.

201. Proof. It is easily proved that the literal sense underlies each and every sentence of Scripture, since all men who are prudent and in possession of their faculties, if they speak, intend to signify something immediately by their words; the same thing must be said even more with regard to God.

202. You will object. *Origen* seems to have denied the literal sense. For he says: “Therefore, just as a man is said to be constituted out of body and soul and spirit; so also the Holy Scripture which by the divine benevolence has been given for the salvation of men... but there are some Scriptures that do not have that corporeal part [that is, a *bodily* sense], as we shall demonstrate in what follows; but it is necessary to seek only the soul and the spirit of Scripture....”⁴

Response. In the place indicated and in what follows *Origen* seems to deny for some passages of Scripture *the obvious and proper sense which appears at the first look* [such as occurs in anthropomorphic sayings: v.gr., Ps. 18:8 *Smoke went up from the nostrils of God* (in the Hebrew text)]; but in no way does he deny the other *literal* sense, by searching for the soul and spirit of Scripture.⁵

203. Scholium. *The first thing to find is the literal sense:* “...Let the

4. *De principiis* 4,11f.: MG 11,365.

5. See *Instit biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.5.

Catholic exegete undertake the task that is the greatest of all those imposed on him, that, namely, of discovering and expounding the genuine meaning of the Sacred Books. In the performance of this task, let the interpreters bear in mind that their foremost and greatest endeavor should be to discern and define clearly that sense of the biblical words which is called *literal*. Aided by the context and by comparison with similar passages, let them therefore by means of their knowledge of languages search out with all diligence the *literal* meaning of the words..." (*Divino afflante*": EB 550; D 3826). See also "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (EB 485 [498]) and "*Humani generis*" (EB 613; D 3888-3889; above n.199).

"Let the teacher [of Holy Scripture] perform his task of interpretation in such a way that in the first place he explains *the literal meaning* which is stated clearly and plainly, and let him make use also, when it is necessary, of the original text...."⁶

Thesis 10. The literal sense of Scripture is unique.

204. State of the question. There is a question about whether in one and the same sentence of Scripture the literal meaning is manifold or unique.

The question is not whether there are two interpretations or several of the same sentence, which are given; but whether there are two or several meanings, and indeed *different from each other* and completely diverse: not therefore that one is fuller or cumulative, or that one is implicit and the other is explicit.

And we are not considering the possibility whether God could intend several literal meanings with the same sentence; but *de facto*, whether he did that.

We are dealing with the meaning which the sacred author intended at least in a confused way, not with other meanings which he perhaps was not aware of, but which were comprehended by God and in some way were intended.

205. The adversaries are, among others, Suarez,⁷ Vázquez,⁸ Bonfrerius,⁹ Zanneccchia.¹⁰

Theologians in the 16th and 17th centuries often speak about the

6. *Ex Instructione Commissionis de re biblica*, May 13, 1950: AAS 42 (1950) 501; EB 598.

7. *De fide* d.17 s.1 n.13; Opera (Vivès) 12,428.

8. *In 1 p. q.1 a.10 disp.17 c.1-4.*

9. *In totam Scripturam sacram praeologia* c.20 a.5; Migne, *Cursus Scripturae* (Paris 1839) 1,211-214.

10. *Divina inspiratio S.Scripturarum* (Rome 1898) 216ff.; *Instit. biblicae* 1^o l.4 n.6.

diversity or multiplicity of the senses of Holy Scripture.¹¹ But in the conception of this matter there is great diversity, and also at times great confusion. Thus sometimes they understand a diversity of readings, or a diversity of translations; sometimes one literal meaning, or a second one, but fuller; sometimes they are referring to a diversity of interpretations... Hence it is clear that this can easily produce confusion, and so it is not easy to draw, from this diversity, a conclusion about the predominant opinion of the time. Therefore the oneness of the literal meaning, and the contemporary limiting of the question to the unique literal sense, stands in opposition to manifold and different meanings: these developments suppose—in our opinion—theological progress.

A. Colunga, O.P., defends a twofold meaning: a literal historical and another full or evangelical meaning, intended by the Holy Spirit, resulting from the progressive historical meanings (which applies mainly to messianic prophecies)¹²; but he is not defending multiple *disparate* meanings, and therefore he is not one of our adversaries. We will speak rather about the “fuller” sense (see n.218ff.), not about a twofold meaning.

Likewise E. Nácar was not thinking about a twofold *disparate* sense, when he defended a twofold literal sense.¹³

206. Doctrine of the Church. The uniqueness of the literal sense, according to the explanation of the state of the question, seems to be simply supposed in the documents of the Church, which exhort all primarily to search eagerly for that. See the letters “*Spiritus Paraclitus*” (EB 485 [498]) and “*Divino afflante*” (EB 550-553; D 3826).

207. Theological note. According to the given explanation the thesis seems to be *certain*.¹⁴

208. Proof. If men speak truly and seriously, and are not lying or joking, they intend only one literal sense. But the sacred authors are thought to act in the same way (i.e., truly and not jokingly), unless the contrary is proved beyond any doubt. Therefore the literal sense of Scripture is unique.

Equivocation would be something else, consisting in the fact that words

11. F. López treats this matter, *La multiplicidad de sentidos literales en la Escritura, según los autores españoles (1550-1650)*: ArchTG 10 (1947) 395-419.

12. ¿Existe pluralidad de sentidos literales?: EstBibl 2 (1943) 423-447.

13. *Sobre la unicidad o duplicidad del sentido literal en la sagrada Escritura*: CiencTom 68 (1945,I) 362-372.

14. “All things considered,” writes Pesch, “it seems that the opinion is to be denied about a manifold literal sense being truly probable; and it is to be desired that after so many debates finally it will be laid to rest in peace” (*De inspiratione* n.555).

have double meanings, which we use legitimately for the sake of laughter.

If the words of Scripture had several literal meanings, the words would be ambiguous, equivocal and open to deceit. But in a mental reservation, which prudent men use at times in order to hide something, they use words that have a double meaning; then only one true sense *ought to be intended*, but what is permitted is a second meaning whereby he is deceived who does not have the right to demand the truth.

209. Objections. Some texts of Holy Scripture can seem to be opposed to our thesis, which are explained in various ways:

1. Ps. 2:7: *You are my son, today I have begotten you*, which St. Paul interprets to be *about the resurrection of Christ* (Acts 13:33), because Jesus in his resurrection was declared glorious and manifested as the Son of God in power; but elsewhere (Heb. 1:5) he understands it to be *about the divinity of Jesus*, since God said to none of the angels: You are my son; finally, the same Paul in another place (Heb. 5:5) applies the text to the *priesthood of Christ*, which was made illustrious by God so that he might be the Pontiff.

Response. In these texts, if the matter is looked at carefully, he is not dealing with a threefold disparate sense, *but with a meaning that is completely harmonious*; so that Jesus, because he is the natural Son of God, also possesses the priesthood, and by his resurrection he is solemnly declared to be the Son of God. Therefore in these texts we are dealing with the fuller sense (*sensus plenior*) or the consequent sense.

2. The words of Isaiah 53:4: *Surely he has borne our sicknesses and carried our sorrows* are interpreted one way in Matt. 8:16f. (on bodily infirmities) and another way in 1 Pet. 2:24 (on spiritual infirmities or sins).

Response. But it is very apparent that in these texts we are not dealing with a twofold disparate sense, but with either an accommodated or a consequent or a fuller sense.

3. The word of Isaiah 53:8: *And as for his generation, who considered...* are understood by some Fathers to be about his eternal generation in the bosom of the Father, but by others about his miraculous temporal generation in the womb of the Bl. Virgin Mary.

Response. But then it is treating a twofold diverse *interpretation* (as also others interpret the text in a different way; see *On Revelation* n.623, v.8); but it is not dealing with a double *meaning*, which is attributed to the text.

4. The words of Caiaphas in John 11:50 can also be cited here: since he was the high priest that year, he prophesied, saying: *it is expedient for you*

that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation should not perish, really understanding it, not about the atoning death of Jesus (as God intended the saying), but in the sense lest the Romans come and the whole nation perish.

Response. In this place the inspired and intended meaning of God is only one, the other is only the human thought of Caiaphas.

5. It is fitting for Holy Scripture that it should have many meanings.

Response. It seems rather to be unfitting, because confusion would easily be generated if that were so.¹⁵

6. The Fathers say that there is no sentence of Scripture which is not full of meanings.¹⁶

Response. It can seem to be so, but their words can be understood about different meanings that are not disparate—typical or accommodated or consequent, or about different explanations.

7. *St. Thomas* at times proposed the diversity of the literal senses in order to answer difficulties: “For this pertains to the dignity of the divine Scripture, that under one letter it contains many meanings, so that it may also be suitable for the different intellects of men, and each one is amazed that he can find in the divine Scripture the truth which he conceived in his mind, and in this way also it is more easily defended against the unbelievers....”¹⁷

Response. But more probably *St. Thomas* did not admit that plurality of disparate meanings, since he treats this in his commentaries.¹⁸

Thesis 11. In Holy Scripture a typical sense must be acknowledged.

210. Definition of terms. *The typical sense* is, as we said in n.195, that which things themselves, or the events signified by the words, in turn signify. Since things or events of themselves can have a similitude with many other things, and therefore an aptitude for signifying several things, from the positive ordination of God they have the power *de facto* to signify something determined; for this reason the typical sense can be known by revelation alone.

A thing signifying something is called a *type* (thus in Rom. 5:14 Adam is called a *τύπος* of a future man); the other things signified is called the *antitype* (thus in 1 Pet. 3:21 baptism is said to be the *ἀντίτυπον* of salvation in the ark by water).

15. See S.Th. I, q. 1, a. 10 ad 10.

16. See n.143,5. And A. Fernández, S.J., wrote about *De mente Sancti Augustini relate ad unitatem sensus literalis* in: *VerDom* (1927) 278-284; and *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.8.

17. *De potentia* q.4 a.1 c.

18. *Quodlib.* 7 a.14-16; I, q. 1, a. 10; and see *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.8.

A type differs from a *symbolic action* (v.gr., cursing of the fig tree: Mark 11:12-14) because the latter is wholly ordered to signifying something and would not exist by itself alone. It also differs from an *allegory* or continuing metaphor (v.gr., the Canticum of Canticles) because the latter has only a literal sense, although it is expressed through a trope.

Types can be *messianic*, *anagogic*, *tropologic*; v.gr., Jerusalem (a city, in the literal sense) prefigures respectively the messianic kingdom, the heavenly fatherland and the soul of the just person.

211. State of the question. We are not saying that in all, even the unimportant sentences of Scripture, a typical sense is always to be found; but in some of them.

212. Adversaries. Besides *rationalists* and *modernists*, who generally deny the inspiration of the sacred books, now we can mention in particular *Origen*, an adversary *by excess*,¹⁹ and also certain Protestants of the 17th century who are called *figurists*, because they try to find a figurative sense in everything.

213. Doctrine of the Church. Already in the *Decree for the Jacobites* the legal prescriptions of the Old Testament were said to have been instituted *to signify something in the future* (D 1348), although it was said indirectly and given as a reason.

Benedict XV in the *Letter "Spiritus Paraclitus"* refers to and teaches the doctrine of St. Jerome, who "once he has firmly established the literal or historical meaning, goes on to seek out deeper and hidden meanings, as to nourish his mind with more delicate food..." (EB 486 [499] through the whole number): as if he were alluding to the spiritual, mystical sense..., that is, to the typical sense (see n.197).

And Pius XII in his *Letter "Divino afflante"* affirms the existence of this typical sense and exhorts Catholics to search for it eagerly:

"Doubtless all *spiritual sense* is not excluded from the Sacred Scripture. For what was said and done in the Old Testament was ordained and disposed by God with such consummate wisdom that *things past prefigured in a spiritual way those that were to come under the new dispensation of grace*. Wherefore the exegete, just as he must search out and expound the *literal* meaning of the words intended and expressed by the sacred writer, so also must he do likewise for the *spiritual* sense, *provided it is clearly*

19. *De principiis* 4,20-26: MG 11,385-400.

intended by God. For God alone could have known this spiritual meaning and have revealed it to us. Now the Divine Savior himself points out to us and teaches us this same sense in the Holy Gospel; the apostles, also, following the example of the Master, profess it in their spoken and written words; the unchanging tradition of the Church approves it; and, finally, the most ancient usage of the liturgy proclaims it, whenever the well-known principle may be rightly applied: 'The rule of prayer is the rule of faith.' Let Catholic exegetes then disclose and expound this spiritual significance, intended and ordained by God, with that care which the dignity of the divine word demands; but let them scrupulously refrain from proposing as the genuine meaning of Sacred Scripture other figurative sense" (EB 552f.; D 3828).—But that he is talking about the *typical sense*, we will explain more at length in n.218.

Theological note. The thesis is a matter of *divine faith*, because it is contained clearly in Scripture.

See also EB 524 (in *Litterae Secretarii Commissionis Biblicae ad Archiepiscopos et Episcopos Italiae*, August 20, 1941): it is a proposition of faith, to be held as a fundamental principle, that Sacred Scripture contains, besides the literal sense, also the spiritual or typical sense, as the praxis of our Lord and of the Apostles taught; but not that this typical sense is contained in every sentence or narration.

214. It is proved from Holy Scripture. Many things which in the O.T. were written in the literal sense, in the N.T. are said by the Apostles *to have been fulfilled in Christ*. Thus for example, Exod. 12:46; Num. 9:12 (about the *paschal lamb*, which are applied to the sacrifice of Jesus in John 19:36); likewise Hosea 11:1 (Matt. 2:15); in Gal. 4:22ff. St. Paul speaks about the two sons of Abraham, one born of the servant woman and the other of the free women... *now this is an allegory*; and see Rom. 5:14; 1 Pet. 3:20f....

Therefore these sayings of the O.T. signified another meaning, besides the literal.

But this new meaning was no a mere accommodation, because the words "to be fulfilled in Christ" demand something else and more.

Therefore many things in the O.T. had a typical sense.

215. It is proved from tradition. In this matter there is a *consensus of the Fathers and theologians*.

Thus, v.gr., St. Augustine, while he acknowledges this typical sense,

warns us about the exaggerations of those who look for a superior meaning in everything: "They seem to me to err greatly who think that none of the things done in that literary genre signify anything other than what was done in that way; thus they are very audacious, who contend that absolutely everything there can be explained with allegorical meanings."²⁰

Similarly St. Jerome, from the teaching of the *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"* teaches about the book of Proverbs, and he often gives the same warning about the other parts of Scripture; he says that we should not be satisfied with the literal sense alone, "but just as we have to seek gold in the earth, for the kernel in the shell, for the chestnut's hidden fruit beneath its hairy coverings, so in Holy Scripture we have to dig deep for its divine meaning."²¹ However, he does warn, when it has to do with seeking the interior meaning in this way, that a certain moderation is to be used, "lest while we are searching for spiritual riches, we seem to make light of the poverty of history"²² (EB 486 [499]).

And Isidore Pelusiota said: "Those who try to transfer the whole Old Testament to Christ, are not lacking in reprehension... But I say necessarily that both things happened, namely, that not everything was said about him, nor that absolutely nothing was said about him."²³

Finally, let us listen to St. Thomas: "... this science has the property, that the things signified by the words have themselves also a signification."²⁴

216. Scholium 1. On the extension of the types. *The Old Testament taken in general is a type of the New Testament.* Thus this is rightly concluded from the words of the Lord (Matt. 12:39ff. about the sign of Jonah; John 3:14 on the lifting up of the serpent in the wilderness), and from the words of the Apostles (Matt. 2:15; John 19:36; 1 Pet. 3:20f.; Gal. 4:22ff.: Heb. 9:9ff.); but especially from 1 Cor. 10:6.11: according to which the experiences of the Israelites *were done as a figure for us*; and from Col. 2:16f.: where the feasts of the Jews are said to be shadows of things to come. Similarly in Heb. 10:1: the law is said to be a shadow of future good things.

In the New Testament now there are no messianic types, but anagogic types of the future glory can be found.²⁵

20. *De civitate Dei* 17,3,2: ML 41,526. See also *ibid.*, 16,2,3: ML 41,479.

21. *In Eccl* 12:9f.: ML 23,1169 C.

22. *In Eccl* 2,24-26: ML23,1085 C.

23. *Epist.* 1.2,195 (to Alexander): MG 78,641.

24. I, q. 1, a. 10 c.

25. See I, q. 1, a. 10. Io. Sailer, O.Cr., demonstrates that there are types in the N.T. (Matt. 3:11: the baptism of John; Luke 5:6ff.: the miraculous catch of fish; Matt. 8:5-13: the Centurion at Capharnaum; Mark 6:13), *Ueber Typen im Neuen Testament: ZkathTh* 69 (1847) 490-496.

On excess in searching for the typical sense, which pertain to the new “symbolic and spiritual” exegesis, see what is said in the *Encyclical “Humani generis”* (EB 613; D 3888; above, n.199).

In order to find the typical sense, besides what is expressly stated in the sacred Writings, one must pay attention to the tradition and the way of acting of the holy Fathers, to liturgical practice, to the analogy of faith, and to the similarity between the events of the Old and New Testaments. Hence, if everything is *done carefully and fittingly*, the *spiritual* way will be found of interpreting Holy Scripture for edification.²⁶

217. Scholium 2. The probative power of the typical sense. The typical sense certainly has probative power, since *it is a sense intended by God*. Therefore both St. Paul and the Apostles make argument from it.

But then it must be certainly established what and under what rationale the type signifies something. But this is either doubtful, or it is already certain from a declaration of Holy Scripture or from the tradition of the ecclesiastical Magisterium. Therefore there is no great utility in the use of the typical sense for a demonstration.²⁷ And, as St. Thomas says, “nothing necessary to faith is contained under the spiritual sense which is not elsewhere put forth by the Scripture in its literal sense.”²⁸

Scholium 3. Whether the typical sense can be called strictly biblical is a disputed question, especially because, since in many cases it was not known by the hagiographer, it was not intended by the hagiographer and therefore it did not come from the instrumental cause of the book; but what is said to be from the hagiographer must also be thought to be said by God or biblical.²⁹

But, actually, there has always been in the Church the custom of speaking about the typical (spiritual) sense as a biblical sense. And so the encyclicals on the Bible speak about it (“*Spiritus Paraclitus*”: EB 486 [499]; “*Divino afflante*”: EB 552f; D 3826-3828), as being a biblical sense. And that is not surprising, since such a sense is intended and stated by the principal author, namely, by the Holy Spirit; and, although it is not intended by the human author, since it is a meaning completely unknown by him, nevertheless de

26. Concerning the spiritual sense and the so-called *spiritual* exegesis, about which much has been said, see especially A. Fernández, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.16; A. Miller, O.S.B., *Zur Typologie des Alten Testaments*: Ant 25 (1950) 425-434; A. Ibañez Arana, *La moderna exegesis “spiritual”*: XII Semana Bíblica Española (1951) (Madrid 1952) 55-95.

27. See S.Th., *Quodlib.* 7 a.14 ad 2.

28. I, q. 10, a. 10 ad 1.

29. See on this sense S. Muñoz Iglesias, *El llamada sentido típico no es estrictamente bíblico*: EstBibl 12 (1953) 159-183.

facto instrumentally it is said by him in what is signified by his own written sentence. However, certainly *it must be conceded that it is not said in the same way and with the same fullness*, as it is said by the Holy Spirit, who knows the meaning and intends to express it.

Therefore the principle that everything which is said by God is said by the hagiographer, in this case is not fully verified, inasmuch, that is, as it is not said in the same way and with the same fullness by both. But this does not prevent us from saying that it is truly from God who inspires the sacred book, and therefore it can and must be called a biblical sense.³⁰

On the other senses or meanings of Holy Scripture

218. The fuller sense³¹ (*sensus plenior*) is said to be that meaning which God intends through the same words of the hagiographer that is richer or clearer than the one which the hagiographer himself understands by his own words and wishes to say. Therefore it is not a meaning completely different and disparate with relation to the literal sense obvious to the hagiographer; but in the same line it is a deeper sense, more distinct, *fuller*, which the hagiographer perceives in a certain vague or confused way, inasmuch as it is expressed with the words of the hagiographer.

Thus, for example, the outlines of the individual prophecies about the Messiah and his messianic kingdom are understood *more fully* after the described complete image or after the fulfilled prophecy; but they were

30. For an admission that the typical sense is strictly biblical, see M. de Tuya, O.P., *El sentido "típico" ¿es sentido bíblico?*: CiencTom 78 (1951) 571-574; by the same author, *El sentido típico del Antiguo Testamento es verdadera y estrictamente sentido de la Biblia*: CiencTom 80 (1953) 625-661; J.A. Oñate, *El llamado sentido típico ¿es estrictamente sentido bíblico viejotestamentario?*: EstBibl 13 (1954) 185-197. See also S. del Páramo, S.J., *El fin de las parábolas de Cristo y el salmo 77*: MiscCom 20 (1953) 253f.; L. Turrado, *El sentido "pleno" de la S. Escritura y la Mariología*: Salmanticensis 1 (1954) 753 in note 17.

31. On the fuller sense see A. Fernández, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ (1951) 1.3 (*De interpretatione*) n.13; Pesch, *De inspiratione* n.499-501; *Sentido plenior, literal, típico, espiritual*: Bibl 34 (1953) 299-326; *Nota referente a los sentidos de la Escritura*: Bibl 34 (1954) 72-79. Also concerning this whole matter in general and its history and the difficulties raised, see S. del Páramo, S.J., *El problema del sentido literal pleno en la Sagrada Escritura* (Comillas 1954); R.E. Brown, *The History and Development of the Theory of a Sensus Plenior*: CathBiblQuart 15 (1953) 141-162; E.F. Sutcliffe, S.J., *The Plenary Sense as a Principle of Interpretation*: Bibl 34 (1953) 333-343; and, among the different studies in the *XII Semana Bíblica Española*, Sept. 1951 (Madrid 1952); S. Muñoz Iglesias, *Problemática del "sensus plenior"*, p.223-254; J.M. Bover, *El problema del sentido bíblico, ampliado a la luz de la filosofía del lenguaje*, p.261-282; M. De Tuya, *Si es posible y en qué medida un "sensus plenior" a la luz del concepto teológico de inspiración* p.283-320; CiencTom 79 (1952) 369-418. Also J. Coppens, *Nouvelles réflexions sur les divers sens des Saintes Ecritures*: NouvrevTh 74 (1952) 3-10; P. Franquesa, C.M.F., *Inspiración, causalidad instrumental y sentido pleno*: XIV Semana Bíblica Española, Sept. 1953 (Madrid 1954) p.187-207; M. Painador, C.M.F., *Justificación del sentido "pleno" dentro de las necesidades a que responde*: *ibid.*, p.421-438; L. Turrado, *El sentido "pleno" de la S. Escritura y la Mariología*: Salmanticensis 1 (1954) 749-759, especially p.752-755; J. Enciso, *Observaciones acerca del sentido pleno*: EstBibl 13 (1954) 325-331; A. Temiño Saiz, *En torno al problema del "sensus plenior"*: EstBibl 14 (1955) 5-47; other authors will be cited below.

intended by God in the sense of this fullness, without the things having been seen by the individual hagiographers with such clarity.

Another example of this fuller sense is the teaching about divine wisdom in Proverbs, Sirach and Wisdom (v.gr., 8:1f.), where the personal nature of this Wisdom is adumbrated and by which the mystery of the Holy Trinity is hinted at,³² and afterwards is to be known *more fully*.³³

The existence of the fuller sense cannot seem to be surprising, for since among us in some situations, for example, of catechism, which is studied by different persons, illiterate persons and children, who are not capable of a fuller understanding, have one kind of understanding of the teachings, while another grasp of the matter is had by theologians, who by speaking among themselves come to understand this fuller sense.

Certain things also, which we see in nature or in some dwelling, are known in one way by some and in another way by others depending on the diversity of understanding, i.e., more distinctly and more abundantly, more explicitly, that is, *more fully*, depending on the situation or circumstances in which the things are known and their relations to other known things.

And a priori it cannot be denied that God could not intend this more abundant sense, which seems to lie beyond what the hagiographer understands expressly and distinctly. For of itself it seems to suffice, if it is intended by the principal cause, since it is of the nature of an instrument to be deficient and it does not extend to all the properties of the effect, which are derived from the power of the principal cause.

The fuller sense of Holy Scripture is known from the collation of other texts of Scripture, whether of the Old or of the New Testament, or from the tradition of the Church.³⁴

Other names. The fuller sense is also the *literal* sense, because it is immediately and directly contained and expressed by the letters and words of the hagiographer. It can be called the *total* sense, since it adds something to the obvious literal sense, which appears immediately. Also it can be called the *implicit* sense, if it is understood to be about some *formal* implication, which is made manifest by a simple explanatory reasoning; not by some explanation which is arrived at with the help of *virtual* reasoning, because then we would be dealing with the consequent sense (below, n.221). But it

32. See v.gr. A. Vaccari, *Il concetto della Sapienza nell'Antico Testamento*: Greg 1 (1920) 218-251.

33. Other examples of the fuller sense, developed more at length, are given by A. Colunga, O.P., *Habitaré en medio de ellos y seré su Dios (Exod 29-45)*: XII Semana Bíblica Española, p. 463-481; J. Leal, S.J., *Sine me nihil potestis facere (Io 15:5)*; *ibid.*, p.483-498.

34. Recently J. Prado, C.S.S.R., *Criterios de fijación de un "sensus plenior" y de su uso en la argumentación teológica*: XII Semana Bíblica Española p.403-401; S. del Páramo, *op.cit.*, p.39-48.

is not right to call that sense *plural*,³⁵ because it is the unique sense with the obvious literal sense, although more profound and more distinct in the same line.

Adversaries. R. Bierberg denies that a fuller sense is contained objectively in the words or sentences of Holy Scripture; unless, accidentally, in a case in which a mediated revelation is expressed, that is, by quoting the words of God.³⁶

G. Courtade also refuses to admit a fuller sense in the inspired authors; but he understands a fuller sense which escapes the knowledge and intention of the hagiographer.³⁷

Doctrine of the Church. It seems that the words of Leo XIII in the *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* not improbably can be referring to the fuller sense: "For the language of the Bible is employed to express, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, many things which are beyond the power and scope of the reason of man—that is to say, *divine mysteries and all that is related to them. There is sometimes in such passages a fullness and a hidden depth of meaning which the letter hardly expresses and which the laws of interpretation hardly warrant.* Moreover, the literal sense itself frequently admits other senses, adapted to illustrate dogma or to confirm morality..." (EB 108 [93]). Although he is speaking in this place directly and primarily about mysteries, still that is not an obstacle that other words, emphasized by us, *seem* able obviously to be extended to the fuller sense of things said in the Scriptures; indeed this sense is both connected with the mysteries and seems to be able to be described fittingly by the emphasized words.³⁸

F.M. Braun, O.P.,³⁹ refers some words concerning *the spiritual sense* to the *fuller sense*, which are read in the *Encyclical "Divino afflante"* (EB 552f.; D 3826; above, n.213) and he wishes to see the fuller sense signified there under the formula: *what was said in the Old Testament*, which is placed in opposition to the literal meaning *which the hagiographer intended*, and it is called the sense *which only God could have known*. Hence he readily

35. It is given this name by D. Buzy, S.C.J., *Un problème d'herméneutique sacrée: Sens plural, plénier et mystique*: L'année théologique 4 (1944) 385-408.

36. *Does Sacred Scripture Have a Sensus Plenior?*: CathBiblQuart 10 (1948) 182-195, especially p. 185ff.189ff.192.

37. *Les Ecritures ont-elles un sens plénier?*: RechScRel 37 (1950) 481-499. — Other more recent authors, who deny the thesis, besides S. Muñoz Iglesias, mentioned above in note 31, are known from the articles cited below.

38. Pesch refers to this place, *De inspiratione* n.500; A. Fernández, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶1.4 n.13 p.382.

39. *Le sens plénier et les encycliques*: RevThom 51 (1951) 294-304.

sees there the characteristics of the fuller sense: which only God knows, and is beyond the intention of the hagiographer.

We will not deny that by “spiritual sense” the fuller sense could practically be signified, although this is strictly the literal sense; just as also the “spiritual sense” can really signify the typical sense, and sometimes the accommodated and the consequent sense⁴⁰ (see on these n.221f.). And so in a recent document of the Church the “spiritual meaning” seems to be fully accepted.⁴¹ – But the question that concerns us now is whether in the indicated place in the Encyclical the *fuller sense* was meant by the “spiritual sense.”

In this regard note that in the indicated place he is treating what was said and done in the *Old Testament*, which contains things of the past which “*prefigured in a spiritual way those that were to come under the new dispensation of grace*”; this surely agrees very well with the *typical sense*, but the fuller sense seems to be described less adequately, since it does not necessarily always prefigure something. – Furthermore, *God alone*—as the text says—*could have known this spiritual meaning* of Scripture, could have known what is signified by it; this of course agrees well with the *typical sense*, but less well with the fuller sense, which surely is known by the hagiographer in an obscure manner. – In addition, it is to be noted that this *spiritual sense* in the terminology of St. Thomas is the *typical sense*.⁴² – And the identity between the spiritual sense and the typical sense could be understood in an Instruction of the Biblical Commission in 1941.⁴³ – Authors also generally understood in the indicated place of the Encyclical that the Pope was speaking about the typical sense, while not including the fuller sense.⁴⁴ – But if in the Encyclical he is speaking about what was *said* or done, which prefigure something, this could therefore be

40. See A. Miller, O.S.B.: Ant 25 (1950) 433.

41. In the *Instructio Commissionis de re biblica*, May 13, 1950: “He should take care to explain in the proper way [a Teacher of Scripture] the spiritual meaning of the words provided that he establishes that it is intended by God according to the wise norms stated repeatedly by the Sovereign Pontiffs. The teacher will all the more easily understand this spiritual sense, which has been explained by the holy Fathers and great exegetes with such zeal and love, and will be able to propose it to his students more religiously, according as he is endowed with greater purity of heart, excellence of understanding, humility of spirit, reverence and love of the revealing God” (EB 599). Therefore it seems to be concerned with the spiritual sense in the ample signification or the *religious* sense for edification.

42. “... That signification whereby things signified by words have themselves also a signification is called the spiritual sense, which is based on the literal, and presupposes it” (I, q. 1, a. 10 c).

43. Against *Dain Cohel* (a pseudonym), who extolled “spiritual” exegesis, while neglecting scientific exegesis; v.gr., “*The spiritual or typical sense, besides being founded on the literal sense, must be proved...*” (EB 524).

44. V.gr., A. Miller, O.S.B.: “The Encyclical “*Divino afflante Spiritu*” seems to be considering only the strictly proved, typical sense, when it speaks about the spiritual sense, even though it does not expressly use the word “typical” (Ant 25 [1950] 431). [Translation from German by K.B.] Likewise A. Fernández, *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶, I.4 n.13 p.388; and others.

said because some thing *by reason of the way in which it is narrated* in the sacred Writings could have a typical sense (see n.196); or also because the hagiographer sometimes could have from divine revelation knowledge of the typical sense which is added by the Lord *to his own words*, and thus by his own words he could intend a prefiguration of the future; therefore these words prefigure just like the deeds.

Therefore it is not fully clear that he is dealing with the fuller sense in the indicated place in the Encyclical.

219. The following reasons are proposed for admitting this fuller sense.⁴⁵

a) In the Old Testament revelation gradually increases, until it is perfect in the New; hence afterwards the meaning is understood *more fully* of those things which were revealed before. Thus in general the adage of St. Augustine is valid and is quoted: *The New Testament is hidden in the Old; and the Old Testament is made clear in the New.*⁴⁶

b) In the Old Testament messianic prophecies are proclaimed gradually, which in turn gradually are fulfilled and which, like every prophecy, shine more in their fulfillment; and there can be no doubt but that God intended the full sense, richer than what the individual prophets or the particular statements expressed.

The prophets did not know fully the time of fulfillment concerning their prophecies about the sufferings and glory of Christ, "it was revealed to them that they were serving not themselves but you, in the things that have now been announced to you by those who preached the good news to you..." (see 1 Pet. 1:10-12). Therefore the prophecies now are understood *more fully* than they were by the prophets who announced them, because now the complete image of the Messiah is apparent, with the circumstances of time, place, etc.

c) Mysteries are contained in Holy Scripture; but the understanding of the mysteries can grow.

See Rom. 16:25-27: "... according to my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation *of the mystery which was kept secret for long ages, but is now disclosed and through the prophetic writings is made known....*"

Other texts are cited (Eph. 3:5f.; John 16:13f.) which show that progress is made in the knowledge of the mysteries; but it is necessary to prove in these texts that the progress is made not only from revelation

45. See Pesch, *De inspiratione*, n.499-501; S. del Páramo, *op.cit.*, p.23-38.

46. "... quamquam et in Vetere [Testamento] Novum lateat, et in Novo Vetus pateat," *In Hept.* 2,73: ML 34,625.

or from the tradition alone, but *through the Scriptures*, so that a more perfect knowledge of the mysteries is said to be expressed or contained in the Scriptures themselves, since we want to prove the *fuller sense* of the Scriptures. But, as is rightly supposed, the revelation and knowledge of many mysteries certainly is contained in the Scriptures, which therefore deservedly are said to have this fuller sense.

d) The way of interpreting the citations of the O.T. by the hagiographers, in the New Testament, whether they are looking at the messianic facts or at dogmatic and moral doctrine, shows (especially when taken all together) that the authors of the N.T. often attribute a richer or more distinct meaning than that which the authors of the O.T. seem to have understood. Therefore Scripture had, besides the obvious literal meaning, another *fuller sense*, intended indeed by God, which the later authors understood more distinctly.⁴⁷

e) The Fathers hand on this teaching about the fuller sense *in their actual writings*.⁴⁸

The Fathers in Antioch expressly, when using their *theory* for the interpretation of the messianic prophecies, in practice come very close to something similar to the fuller sense. For, according to them, the prophets both saw and intended to express immediately the historical fact and the corresponding messianic fact; wherefore the loftier messianic sense, according to them, was expressed together with the historical sense, although incompletely.⁴⁹

f) Saint Thomas seems to acknowledge completely the fuller sense. For, when he distinguished well mere *prophetic instinct*, when there is no awareness of the motion of God, and a *true prophet* who knows what he sees or says or does, Thomas says: "it must be observed that since the prophet's mind is a defective instrument, as stated above, *even true prophets know not all that the Holy Ghost means by the things they see, or speak, or even do.*"⁵⁰ Now concerning what is said in this place, it seems that it should be understood not to be about a plurality of senses intended by God, but

47. Recently L. Turrado wrote about this matter, ¿Se demuestra la existencia del "sensus plenior" por las citas que el Nuevo Testamento hace del Antiguo?: XII Semana Bíblica Española p.331-378. In the contrary sense, S. de Ausejo, O.F.M.Cap., *Los textos del A. T. citados por S.Juan no ofrecen base de apoyo a la teoría del sentido pleno*: see EstBibl 12 (1953) 417f.

48. See St. Augustine, *De doctrina christiana* 3,28: ML 34,80; *In Io* 1:1: ML 35,1379; St. Jerome, *In Eph* 3:5: ML 26,510-512.

49. On this theory see A. Vaccari, *La Θεωπία nella scuola esegetica di Antiochia*: Bibl 1 (1920) 3-26; P. Ternant, *La θεωπία d'Antioche dans le cadre des sens de l'Écriture*: Bibl 34 (1953) 135-158, 354-383, 456-486. – Objections against the full sense are proposed by P. Bellet, O.S.B., ¿Utilizaron los Santos Padres, especialmente los antioquenos, el "sensus plenior" en sus commentrios?: XII Semana Bíblica Española, p.379-402.

50. II-II, q. 173, a. 4 c.

about the fuller sense surely intended by the Holy Spirit, but not distinctly apprehended by the deficient instrument. But if that is said directly by the Angelic Doctor about a prophet, *it can also be applied to a hagiographer*.⁵¹

220. You will say: 1) To speak is to express one's own thought. But the things that are said in the fuller sense do not express the thought of the hagiographer himself. Therefore the things that are said in the fuller sense the hagiographer cannot say. Therefore they do not make up the sense of Scripture.

I distinguish the major. To speak in the literal sense is to express one's own thought, *conceded*; to speak in the literal fuller sense is to express one's own thought, *I subdistinguish*: thought in a confused way in the words by which it is expressed, *conceded*; thought in a distinct way, *again I subdistinguish*: by the principal author, *conceded*; by the deficient instrumental author, *I ask for proof or I deny it*.

The action of the principal agent is not to be measured *qualitatively* by the qualitative, limited and deficient measure of the instrumental agent. The principal agent causes primarily the power of the effect, and measures it.

Moreover, it cannot be argued *a priori*, from just any prejudiced theory about the nature of an instrumental cause, *against* the qualities of the action of the principal cause of the sacred books, if this action and its properties *positively* are established from some other source. And the Magisterium of the Church has never taught that the hagiographer must know everything with complete clarity, which God intends to communicate with his words in the Scriptures.

2) According to the *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* (EB 125 [110] D 3293) God by his supernatural power so moved and impelled them to write and assisted them that "*all the things* which he ordered, and those only, they, *first rightly understood*, then *willed faithfully to write down*, and finally *expressed* in apt words." Therefore the fuller sense, which escaped the thought and intention of the hagiographer, is not the sense of Scripture.

Response. a) If he proved this, it would also be a proof against the existence of the typical sense, surely intended by God; since, at least often, the typical sense does not seem to be apprehended by the hagiographer.⁵²

b) *I distinguish the antecedent.* God moved the hagiographers and assisted them in their writing so that they would rightly conceive at least in

51. This argument from the analogy of the instrumental action of the hagiographer with the instrumental action of the prophet was treated recently by M. de Tuya, *loc.cit.*: *CiencTom* 79 (1952) 389-391. For an opposing opinion, see A. Ibañez, *Las cuestiones "De prophetia" en Santo Tomás y la inspiración bíblica*: *ScriptVict* 1 (1954) 256-312, especially p.290f. – M. de Tuya reviews the advantages which are to be found in the fuller sense, *loc.cit.*, p.414-418.

52. This analogy with the typical sense is insisted on, and rightly so, by M. de Tuya, *loc.cit.*: *CiencTom* 79 (1952) 391-394; S. del Páramo, *loc.cit.*, p.51; and by others.

a confused way all the things that he ordered them to write, *conceded*; so that they would always understand those things *distinctly* and with fullness, just as the divine mind conceives them or wishes to communicate in the course of time, *I ask for proof of this or I deny it*.

The speaker object to the first response: It is not valid to respond by invoking the typical sense. For, the typical sense is not an inspired sense nor a sense of Scripture, but “rather it is the sense of the thing written.”⁵³

I distinguish the added reason. The typical sense is not a sense of Scripture inasmuch as it is not the literal sense nor is it expressed directly in Holy Scripture, *conceded*; inasmuch as it is not known and intended at least by God, and sometimes also it can be known by the hagiographer, *denied*. – Similarly, therefore, it would have to be said about the fuller sense; however with this difference, that the fuller sense is expressed directly and immediately by the literal sense in Scripture, but it is grasped in a confused manner by the hagiographer.

3) In inspiration the hagiographer is a *rational* instrument. Therefore he must act by understanding what he writes. But he does not understand the fuller sense. Therefore there cannot be a fuller sense in inspiration.

Response a) This is said *a priori*. But it is necessary to define the nature and action of the instrument in inspiration not *a priori*, but *a posteriori*.

b) This would be a proof against the existence of the typical sense, which of itself is even less understood by the hagiographer.

c) *I concede the first antecedent and consequent. I deny the minor*. The hagiographer does not understand the fuller sense in a confused manner, inasmuch as this sense is expressed by his own words, *denied*; he does not understand it distinctly, *conceded*. *But I deny the supposition*, namely, that the instrument (even a rational one) must fully possess the total knowledge and total intention of the principal cause, which is reflected in the effect.

The speaker insists: Something is not affirmed unless it is known. But the hagiographer does not know the fuller sense. Therefore the fuller sense is not affirmed by the hagiographer and so it is not biblical.

I distinguish the major. Something is not affirmed unless it is known, when the subjective concept of the thing in no way corresponds to the objective concept of what is said, *conceded*; when the subjective concept corresponds to the objective concept with more or less clarity and distinction, *I subdistinguish*: then what is known expressly is affirmed, *conceded*; something else is not affirmed which is contained confusedly and implicitly in what is said, *again I subdistinguish*, then it is not *intended expressly* to say that, *conceded*, it is not said *de facto*, although confusedly

53. This was said by Bainvel, *De Scriptura sacra* n.214.

and implicitly, *denied*. *I also distinguish the minor*. The hagiographer does not know the full sense expressly and clearly, *conceded*; in an implicit and confused way, *I subdistinguish*, so that he does not intend expressly to say that, *conceded*; so that de facto he does not say it and it is not intended by the principal cause, *denied*.

d) If the human author did not grasp everything that God intended to express, de facto he was like a scribe who mechanically wrote what God wanted to express. But we rejected this, when we treated verbal inspiration.

I distinguish the major. He was a scribe who in the individual sentences understood nothing about the things written by him, *denied*; who did not understand everything that was contained in the individual sentences, *I subdistinguish*, he did not understand it distinctly, *conceded*; he did not understand it at least confusedly, *denied*. And it is always necessary that the human mind does not fully understand what God knows and intends with divine formulas; because man's consciousness can never apprehend and measure everything that God apprehends and can will to signify. Mechanical inspiration, which we have rejected, is totally different from the present case.

221. The consequent sense is that which is not contained formally in the sacred words, but *it follows* from them by reasoning; it is like a theological conclusion.

When, v.gr., in Deut. 25:4 it is said: *You shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain* (see 1 Cor. 9:9), then the precept on the way to handle animals is contained formally; and nowhere (although someone less probably may say it has a typical sense) are such animals presented as types of evangelical workers. But St. Paul draws from that the conclusion: *Who serves as a soldier at his own expense? Who plants a vineyard without eating any of its fruit?*... (1 Cor. 9:7); and he draws this conclusion *as if it were said in Scripture (Do I say this on human authority?, v.8)*, that is, he concludes this way with the help of the premise: *Is it for oxen that God is concerned?* (and not rather for men?) (v.9).

Therefore he is not dealing with the biblical sense strictly speaking, but it can be called speaking in a broad sense, since "God provided one premise and he foresaw that the other one would be added to it."⁵⁴

222. The accommodated sense is said to be present when the words of Scripture are adapted to something different than what the sacred author intended. It helps to illustrate something, but not to prove it.

54. *Instit. biblicae* 1^o 1.4 n.14. – C.F. De Vine, C.S.S.R., wrote about the consequent sense, *The Consequent Sense*: *CathBiblQuart* 2 (1940) 145-155.

“Neither should those passages be neglected [by the Catholic exegete],” said Leo XIII, “which the Fathers have understood in an allegorical or figurative sense, more especially when such interpretation is justified by the literal, and when it rests on the authority of many. For this method of interpretation has been received by the Church from the Apostles, and has been approved by her own practice, as the holy Liturgy attests; although it is true that the holy Fathers did not thereby pretend directly to demonstrate dogmas of faith, but used it as a means of promoting virtue and piety” (“*Providentissimus*”: EB 112 [97]).

On this matter St. Jerome said: “You perceive how even places are and contrary to the truth of history. And how those things which we have interpreted literally about the Chaldeans, now according to a figurative way of speaking seem to proclaim the mercy and freedom of those who have escaped the hands of the Chaldeans. *History is strict and it does not have the ability to wander. Figurative language is free and is circumscribed by these laws*, so that it may follow the guidance of intelligence and the context of the words, and in things very different from each other violent things should not be mixed in.”⁵⁵

And the same Jerome says elsewhere: “And we say these things not to condemn a metaphorical understanding, but because a spiritual interpretation should follow the order of history: because many ignorant persons fall into insane errors with regard to the Scriptures.”⁵⁶

223. An accommodation becomes excellent, if the sense is handled *with extension*, as in the Liturgy what is said about Noah and Abraham in Sirach 44:17.20 is accommodated to other things. The accommodation is less suitable if it is done *by a mere allusion* to a word. But it is bad, if the *interpretation is false*.⁵⁷

224. Pius XII had this to say about moderation in the use of the accommodated sense: “... but let them scrupulously refrain from proposing as the genuine meaning of Sacred Scripture other figurative senses. It may indeed be useful, especially in preaching, to illustrate, and present the matters of faith and morals by a broader use of the Sacred Text in the figurative sense, provided this be done with moderation and restraint; it should, however, never be forgotten that this use of the Sacred Scripture is, as it were, *extrinsic* to it and *accidental*...” (“*Divino afflante*”: EB 553).

55. *Comment. in Habacuc* 1,6-11: ML 25,1343.

56. *Comment. in Isa.* L.5 c.13,19: ML 24,162f.

57. See J.V. Bainvel, *Les contresens bibliques des prédicateurs*³ (Paris 1924); L.-Ct. Fillion, *L'étude de la Bible* (Paris 1922) 100-102; I. Gomá, *La Biblia y la predicación* (Barcelona 1927) c.13.

225. Scholium⁵⁸ 1. *A distinction between the historical sense and the dogmatic sense* is not to be admitted, if a separation between both of them is maintained; so that the former applies to independent critics, but the latter to the Church. However the situation is different, if the reason given is to find the true meaning, whether with the help of literary critics, or with the help of dogmatic experts; or if, by reason of the material, different aspects of the same text are under consideration.

2. *The sense of the hagiographer* (literal sense) *is always the sense of God*, one and the same sense; but not everything that God intends to signify is apprehended by the hagiographer (typical sense, fuller sense distinctly and not confusedly).

58. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.18f.

ARTICLE II

ON THE WAY OF FINDING THE SENSE OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

226. Heuristics *deals with the way and the criteria in order to find the meaning of Scripture.*

These criteria can be *literary* or *dogmatic*. They correspond to the human aspect of the sacred books; they apply also to the divine aspect of the books, since they have God as their author, and they have been entrusted to the custody of the Church.

227. On the literary criteria.¹ *The literary criteria* examine carefully the native power of words and expressions, both the grammatical power and the rhetorical power. The study of and recourse to the *original languages* is especially recommended by Pius XII in the *Encyclical "Divino afflante"* (EB 547). Likewise *the importance of textual criticism* is extolled in the same place (EB 548).

228. This study having been presupposed, these criteria discern the meaning of words and sentences according as they are found in a definite place. Therefore these criteria *teach that the nature of the context* must be taken into consideration, both grammatical and logical, and psychological and visual (certainly if with the prophetic perspective several similar events are considered with one look, but placed in a different framework of time: v.gr., such would be the destruction of Jerusalem and the final coming of the Lord).

Also according to these criteria attention must be paid to the poetic form, by noting the parallelism or rhythm of the sentences; attention must also be paid to parallel passages, where the same argument is being presented, although coming from different human authors, because the principal author is the one God.

229. Attention must also be paid to the unity and progressive nature of revelation. To this point the words of *St. Bonaventure* can be applied: "All Scripture is like a cithara, where the lower string by itself does not produce harmony, but it does with the others; similarly, one text of Scripture depends on another, and so one place looks to a thousand places."² Wherefore the teachings of Scripture illustrate each other.

1. *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶1.4 n.20-50.

2. *In Hexaemeron* coll.19 n.7: Opera (Quaracchi) 6,421.

230. But those things are also to be investigated diligently whereby the sacred books can be illustrated: concerning the author, concerning his character and background; concerning the occasion and purpose of the book; concerning the historical, social, intellectual and religious conditions of that time; concerning the customs and morals of Palestine and the neighboring regions....

Also the special literary form of each book is to be kept in mind with great care (see n.188-190).

On the importance of Philology and Archeology, of Geography and History for the interpretation of Holy Scripture, see "*Divino afflante*" (EB 555-565). Regarding the modern discoveries with reference to the interpretation of Scripture, *ibid.* (EB 546).³

But after mentioning these literary criteria, we now move on to consider the dogmatic criteria.

More recently the Holy See has also insisted on *the correct way of finding the literal meaning*, that is, not only by taking into consideration the nature of the words themselves and of the proximate context, but also to consider what Holy Scripture is teaching in other similar passages, what the explanation is of the same text in the Fathers and in Catholic tradition, what the "analogy of faith" demands, what finally the Magisterium of the Church says about that text. In addition, to accomplish this it is necessary both to know and to love all of sacred Theology (*Instructio Commissionis de re biblica*, May 13, 1950: EB 598).

On the dogmatic criteria⁴

231. 1) *All interpretation is to be rejected which supposes even the slightest error in the hagiographer:* because in virtue of inspiration he enjoys absolute inerrancy, as we have seen. Therefore, if there is some difficulty, one must pay careful attention to what the genuine intention of the author was. The words of St. Augustine are to the point: "... if I do find anything in those books [the canonical Scriptures] which seems contrary to truth, I decide that either the text is corrupt, or the translator did not follow what was really said, or that I failed to understand it."⁵

3. On the necessity of study and what it should be for the interpretation of Holy Scripture was treated by A. Vaccari, S.J., *El estudio de la sagrada Escritura* (Barcelona 1944) 85ff.

4. See *Instit. biblicae* 1° 1.4 n.86-101; E. Mangenot, *Herméneutique*: DB 3,612-633. Bl. John of Avila treats submission to the Church in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, *Audi filia* c.46.

5. *Epist.* 82 (to Jerome) 1,5: R 1421.

Thesis 12. It belongs to the Church “to judge about the true meaning and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures.”

Vacant, *Etudes théologiques sur les Constitutions du Concile Vatican t.1 c.2 § 4*; Th. Granderath, *Constitutiones Concilii Vaticani* (1892) 53-81; E. Mangelot and J. Riviere, *Interprétation de l'Ecriture*: DTC 7, 2290-2343; J.B. Nisius, *Ueber das Verhältnis der kirchlichen Lehrgewalt zur Schriftauslegung*: ZkathTh 23 (1899) 282-311, 460-500 [see *ibid.* p.185-188, and 21 (1897) 162-167]; A. Durand, *Exégèse, tradition et Eglise*: DAFC 1,1835-1841.

232. The adversaries, besides the rationalists and modernists who deny the divine character of the sacred books, now *Protestants* in general should be mentioned, who defend the absolute private interpretation or *free examination* of Scripture.

There are also some *more recent authors*, mentioned in the *Encyclical “Humani generis,”* who “in interpreting Scripture, will take no account of the analogy of faith and the tradition of the Church. Thus they judge the doctrine of the Fathers and of the Teaching Church by the norm of Holy Scripture, interpreted by the purely human reason of exegetes, instead of explaining Holy Scripture according to the mind of the Church that Christ our Lord has appointed guardian and interpreter of the whole deposit of divinely revealed truth” (D 3887; EB 612).

233. Doctrine of the Church. *The words of the thesis are taken from the Council of Trent* (D 1507) *and from Vatican Council I* (D 3007).

The decree of Trent *formally* is disciplinary and negative, since in a disciplinary matter “in order to restrain irresponsible minds” it forbids that anyone, relying on his own prudence, in matters of faith and morals, should dare to interpret Holy Scripture “contrary to the meaning that Holy Mother the Church has held and holds—*since it belongs to her to judge the true meaning and interpretation of Holy Scripture.*” But this decree *fundamentally* is dogmatic and positive, because it proposes dogma as the foundation, that is, “since it belongs to her [the Church] to judge the true meaning and interpretation of Holy Scripture.” And this same idea is repeated in the *Tridentine Profession of Faith* (D 1863).

234. But the Vatican Council renewed the Tridentine decree, so that *formally it is positive and dogmatic*, against those who twisted the decree to their own meaning, saying that it is only disciplinary and does not have absolute value; or that it only compels one not to deny a dogma defined by the Church, but that it is permitted to reject a dogmatic interpretation of the Church.

235. In these documents the right of the Church is asserted *concerning matters of faith and morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine*, that is, when it is dealing with matters by their own nature religious, not profane; or—in other words—about matters which are revealed because of themselves, because they are for their own sake intended in revelation, not for the sake of something else; or they are things that are per se credible, because they are per se the substance of faith, not something accidental. Therefore they are dogmas connected with them for their own sake, and not only because they are contained in the sacred books.

Moreover, please note that this formula does not exclude positively other things from the interpretation of the Church (that is, things not pertaining to faith or morals), but it *prescinds* from them.

Consult also, regarding the doctrine of the Church on this matter, the *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* (EB 108f. [93f.], *the condemnations of the Modernists* (D 3402, 3404), and the *Encyclical "Divino afflante"* (EB 551; D 3827).

And in the *Encyclical "Humani generis"* it says: "... We must grieve that by no means a few of these [who acknowledge Scripture as the word of God], the more firmly they cling to the word of God, that much more diminish human reason; and the more they exalt the authority of God who reveals, the more sharply they spurn the Magisterium of the Church, instituted by Christ the Lord to guard and interpret the truths revealed by God. This indeed is not only in open contradiction to Sacred Scripture, but is proved false from actual experience..." (D 2307; 34th ed.).

Theological note. The thesis is a matter of *divine and Catholic faith* (D 1863, 3007).

236. Proof. A. In addition to the dogmatic declarations quoted above, on the basis of which the thesis is certain, it can also be proved or confirmed *from the way of speaking of Sacred Scripture*.

a) *St. Peter* in 2 Pet. 1:20 says: "No prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation" (ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται).

Ἐπιλύσις does not mean an *inquiry*, as if the prophecy is not said to have come from human effort, but it means an *explanation* or *interpretation*; and this word was used *for dreams and for parables*, which needed an interpretation.

b) The sense of Scripture is *opened* by the Lord for the disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:45), and it is not left to private interpretation; likewise Philip *guides* (ὁδηγήσει) the eunuch in the reading and interpretation of the prophet Isaiah (Acts 8:31).

237. B. If the sacred books have been entrusted to the Church, just as the whole deposit of faith and the complete revelation, which must be preserved and guarded by her, while she explains it as the teacher of revelation established by the Lord: doubtless it will belong to the Church to judge concerning the true meaning and interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures.

238. C. The praxis of the Church always was and still is, that she claims for herself this right of proposing authentically the meaning of Scripture (see n.46); and she, the authentic and infallible teacher of revelation, both knows well the limits of her own power and cannot deceive us in teaching us about this power.

D. *The principle of the Protestants of private interpretation leads to complete subjectivism*, as the history itself of Protestantism shows from the very beginning; and it ignores the truly prudent principle of paying attention to traditional authority and the sense of tradition....

239. Scholium. *On the right of the Church of interpreting things which do not pertain to faith and morals.*

Concerning things that do not pertain to faith and morals, but *which are contained in Scripture*, the Church also has the right of interpreting them authentically; because *all the sentences of Scripture are inspired, and therefore the word of God*, which has been entrusted to the Church in order to guard it. And the *proposition of the Modernists* was condemned, according to which "... the Church has no right to pass judgment on the assertions of the human sciences" (D 3405).

240. However, concerning this right *it is disputed whether it is direct and positive, or indirect and negative*. It seems necessary to say, with many others, that this right in things which do not pertain to faith and morals is *indirect*; for, there are things or propositions in the sacred books that are purely scientific and profane (v.gr., Judg. 10:4), which by their nature do not have a connection with the eternal salvation of men, and therefore *by reason of the matter* fall outside of the area of the Magisterium of the Church and do not pertain "to the edification of Christian doctrine." But indirectly the Magisterium does touch them, since, if they are falsely explained, they could contradict dogma. Therefore the Church has the *negative* right, that is, of rejecting any interpretation which contradicts dogma or would support the presence of error in the hagiographer.

For the Church "which, along with the apostolic office of teaching, received the charge of guarding the deposit of faith, has also from God the

right and the duty to proscribe what is falsely called knowledge [1 Tim. 6:20], lest anyone be deceived by philosophy and vain fallacy [see Col. 2:8]..." (D 3018). See also D 3042 in the corresponding canon.

Therefore the right of the Church is *indirect and negative*.

241. *Others claim that profane propositions of this kind*, which are contained in Scripture, are the word of God, all of which is entrusted to the Church; therefore the Church, they say, has a direct and positive right to interpret them.

*Please note, however,*⁶ that these propositions are *the word of God by reason of inspiration*, and that the Church for this reason can judge whether an interpretation is opposed to *inspiration*; and the indirect right suffices for this. For, from the fact that a proposition is the word of God, a direct right of the Church *positively* of defining its meaning does not therefore necessarily follow, unless because of the argument it has some connection with things that are the direct object of the Magisterium of the Church.

242. From what has been said, therefore, it is certain that the Church can reject any interpretation in any place in Scripture. Also with regard to every sentence she can define whether it has a connection with faith and morals. Therefore, with the admission of only an indirect right, *everything in Scripture is subject to the judgment of the Church*.

243. You will object. In this way scientific freedom, which fosters progress, is diminished and hindered,

Response. Indeed *freedom from restraint or a false freedom* is diminished; but not true freedom. Just as a lighthouse for sailors, or a teacher explaining something for his pupils, does not hinder them in what they are doing, but rather helps them. Moreover, there is a large field for any private teacher in matters that have not yet been defined, and about which there are several interpretations, which he is free to choose from. See "*Providentissimus*" (EB 109 [94] and "*Divino afflante*" (EB 558-565; D 3829-3830).

How the meaning is known "which Holy Mother the Church has held and holds" (D 1507, 1863, 3007)⁷

244. I. *The meaning of the Church is known first of all from the definitions of the Councils and of the Roman Pontiffs*, which can be found in various

6. See *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.91.

7. See *Instit. biblicae* 1⁶ 1.4 n.94-101.

ways: a) *Directly and positively*, when the meaning of a biblical text is the direct and formal object of a definition, and by declaring positively its true meaning (v.gr., D 1615; on John 3:5: true water is necessary for Baptism, and therefore the words *Unless one is born of water...* are not to be distorted into a metaphor).

245. b) *Directly and negatively*, if some meaning is excluded by a direct declaration (v.gr., D 1727; on John 6:53: in the words *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood...* is not a precept of the Lord for communion under both species).

c) *Indirectly and positively*, when the biblical text is adduced as an argument of some doctrine, which itself is directly mentioned and defined (v.gr., D 1512; on Rom. 5:12: on original sin in all men, because a denial would contradict the Apostle saying *Sin came into the world through one man...*).

246. d) *Indirectly and negatively*, when a doctrine is excluded and condemned which its advocates want to prove by some biblical text (v.gr., D 434; on the errors of Theodore of Mopsuestia who denied the substantial unity of the Word of God with Christ by appealing to Eph. 5:31 [Gen. 2:24]: *The two shall be in one flesh*; he also said that Christ by the words in John 20:22 *Receive the Holy Spirit...* did not give them the Holy Spirit, but only breathed on them figuratively; and also that Thomas in John 20:28 did not say the words about God *My Lord and my God*, but because he was struck by the miracle of the resurrection).

247. If the biblical text is mentioned only indirectly, it will have to be considered whether it is cited *for a mere illustration*, in which case the meaning of the text would not be defined; *or whether it is cited for a proof*, so that from the way of speaking it is certain that the Fathers *positively* are affirming the meaning of that cited text (as in D 1512), or are declaring in this way that it has always been understood in the Church in this way (as in D 1514): because from the fact alone that a text is cited as proof, a definition is not necessarily given to it, as it is given to the doctrine confirmed by that proof.

Texts directly defined are very few⁸; but there are many which have been declared indirectly.

248. II. *The meaning of the Church is known also from the Decrees*

8. A. Durand says there are 12: DAFC 1,1838.

of the Sacred Congregations and of the Pontifical Biblical Commission; Catholic are bound to submit themselves with an internal assent to the decrees of these organs of the Holy See, even though they are not published by a proclamation that is *ex cathedra*, and they are to do this especially from a motive of religious obedience which is morally certain.

This authority of the decrees of the Biblical Commission is certain from the *Motu proprio* of Pius X "*Praestantia Scripturae*" November 18, 1907 (D 3503; EB 286 [279]); this decree was referred to by the same Commission in a decree dated February 27, 1934 (EB 519).⁹ See also the recommendation of the same decrees in the *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"* (EB 474 [487]).

249. External obsequious silence is not sufficient, but *internal assent* is required (see D 2880; EB¹ 280), because the doctrine is received only through internal assent. However, decisions of this kind are not absolutely infallible nor irrevocable; therefore the assent due to them, although anyone rightly assents to them without a prudent fear of being in error (i.e., morally certain), still it is not absolute nor absolutely irreformable.¹⁰

250. III. *The sense of the Church is known also from the unanimous consent of the Fathers.* For a) the sense of the Church is the unanimous consent of the Fathers, who are an important part of the teaching Church; b) such unanimous consent of the Fathers in matters faith and morals is a criterion of divine tradition; c) from the decrees of Trent (D 1507) and Vatican I (D 3007) no one can, according to the sense of the Church, interpret Scripture contrary to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

251. *The required unanimity is not physical but moral;* v.gr., if the outstanding Fathers of several churches agree, who are seen then, as it were, to represent the others.

But it does not suffice that they propose the matter merely as an opinion; rather, *they must assert the matter as pertaining to faith or actually related with the faith:* not precisely that they are treating the dogmatic interpretation of some text, but that they propose an interpretation as pertaining to the faith, or as necessary in order to preserve Catholic unity, etc.

9. AAS 26 (1934) 131; on the occasion of the condemnation of a certain book.

10. On the question of Galileo regarding the interpretation of Holy Scripture, see the brief treatment in *Institut. biblicae* 1^o 1.4 n.96. On the authenticity of the "Johannine comma" (1 John 5:7), and on the mind of the Congregation of the Holy Office concerning this matter, see EB 135f. [120f.]; D 3681-3682; and above, n.158 in the note.

252. *Purely scientific texts* as such are not the object of the dogmatic tradition, but only inasmuch as they are found in the Scriptures; therefore concerning these there is no authentic interpretation of the Fathers, unless the Fathers explain it as pertaining to the purpose of the Church; in this case it should not be considered as something purely scientific. But even as private doctors the Fathers are to be held in high regard.

253. The *Encyclical "Providentissimus"* speaks about *the importance of the authority of the Fathers* in the interpretation of Holy Scripture: "The holy Fathers 'to whom, after the Apostles, the Church owes its growth—who have planted, watered, built, governed, and cherished it,'¹¹ the holy Fathers, We say, are of supreme authority, whenever they all interpret in one and the same manner any text of the Bible, as pertaining to the doctrine of faith or morals; for their unanimity clearly evinces that such interpretation has come down from the Apostles as a matter of Catholic faith. *The opinion of the Fathers is also of very great weight when they treat of these matters in their capacity of doctors*, unofficially; not only because they excel in their knowledge of revealed doctrine and in their acquaintance with many things which are useful in understanding the apostolic Books, but because they are men of eminent sanctity and of ardent zeal for the truth, on whom God has bestowed a more ample measure of his light. *Wherefore the expositor should make it his duty to follow their footsteps with all reverence, and to use their labors with intelligent appreciation*" (EB 111 [96]). The same argument is given in "*Divino afflante*" (EB 554).

254. But not everything is to be received in the same way: "The unshrinking defense of the Holy Scripture, however, does not require that we should equally uphold all the opinions which each of the Fathers or the more recent interpreters have put forth in explaining it; for it may be that, in commenting on passages where physical matters occur, they have sometimes expressed the ideas of their own times, and thus made statements which in these days have been abandoned as incorrect. Hence, *in their interpretations, we must carefully note what they lay down as belonging to faith, or as intimately connected with faith—what they are unanimous in*. For in those things that do not come under the obligation of faith, the Saints were at liberty to hold divergent opinions, just as we ourselves are, according to the saying of St. Thomas"¹² ("*Providentissimus*": EB 122 [107]).

11. St. Augustine, *Contra Iulianum* 2,10,37: R 1900.

12. *In 2 Sent.* D.2 q.1 a.3.

255. Note also "... that in the immense matter contained in the Sacred Books—legislative, historical, sapiential and prophetic—there are but few texts whose sense has been defined by the authority of the Church, nor are those more numerous about which the teaching of the holy Fathers is unanimous. There remain therefore many things, and of the greatest importance, in the discussion and exposition of which the skill and genius of Catholic commentators may and ought to be freely exercised..." ("*Divino afflante*": EB 565). See also on this matter Leo XIII in the *Encyclical "Vigilantiae"* (EB 143 [136]).

Likewise Benedict XV in the *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"* approves the counsel of those "who with the assistance of critical methods, seek to discover new ways of explaining the difficulties in Holy Scripture, whether for their own guidance or to help others. But we remind them that they will only come to miserable grief if they neglect our predecessor's injunctions and overstep the limits set by the Fathers" (EB 453 [466]).¹³

256. *On the authority of the Fathers and of Tradition in determining the author of a sacred book. If the authors of the sacred books are given in the sacred books themselves, whether explicitly (as, for example, St. Paul and St. Peter in the dedications and salutations of the letters) or also implicitly or virtually (like St. John the Apostle in the gospel named for him, see On Revelation n.314ff., where there is an internal argument for its genuineness): then the question of the author of the book has been revealed to us by God, and is a matter of faith, or at least it is connected with faith.*

257. But *essentially* and speaking speculatively, while not going into particular cases, the name of the author does not seem to be of great importance regarding the substance of what is said. Hence *St. Gregory* could write: "Who wrote this [the book of Job], is a question that is very superfluous, since the author of the book is faithfully believed to be the Holy Spirit... If we read the words of some important man in a letter received from him, and we ask what kind of pen was used to write it, it would be really ridiculous to know the author of the letter and to understand its meaning, but to inquire with what kind of pen the words of the letter were written with..."¹⁴ And *Theodoret* in the same vein: "They said that all of the Psalms were not by David, but some were by others... What do I care... since all of them were written by the divine inspiration of the Spirit."¹⁵

13. On false freedom, see EB 285 [287] 463 [476].

14. *Moral. Praef.* 1,2: R 2302.

15. *In Ps praef.*: R 2158.

258. *But the Magisterium of the Church has often determined positively* what must be held regarding the authors of the sacred books: on the author of the Pentateuch (D 3394-3397; EB 181-184 [174-177]), on John as the author of the fourth gospel (D 3398f.; EB 187f. [180f.]), on the author of the book of Isaiah (D 3507-3509; EB 293-295 [289-291]), on the authors of the Psalms (D 3521-3527; EB 344-350 [340-346]), on the authors of the first gospel (D 3561, 3564; EB 388 [408]), of the second and third gospels (D 3568; EB 395 [408]), and of the book of the Acts of the Apostles (D 3581f.; EB 406f. [419f.]); also on the author of the pastoral epistles (D 3587-3589; EB 412-414 [425-427]), and of the letter to the Hebrews (D 3591f.; EB 416f. [429f.]). But since the Magisterium does not deal with purely profane matters, by interpreting them directly and positively, it must be held that questions about the authors of the sacred books *often*, even if they are not revealed, still are at least connected with revealed things; and therefore questions of this nature, at least often, are not at all free matter.

259. Of course the area of the magisterium of the Fathers is the area of the magisterium of the Church; and so one must hold that at least often questions about the authors of the sacred books are the object of the magisterium of the Fathers, since it concerns a matter connected with revealed truths. But in order to argue from the Fathers *dogmatically*, it will be necessary to demonstrate a) the unanimity of the consent of the Fathers, and b) and of those asserting the matter as dogmatic or as necessarily connected with dogma; but not at all if only *on the occasion* of some dogmatic explanation they mention the name of an author who is thought to be the correct one.

But even then their *human* authority, although it is not dogmatic, should not be rejected or thought light of.¹⁶

260. *On the authority of the Fathers in determining the literary genre of the sacred books.* The literary genre of a book is connected essentially and intrinsically with the true sense of the sentences of the book. For the sentences have a completely different meaning, if it has another literary genre, for example, depending on whether the literary genre is poetic, allegorical, romantic, legendary, strictly historical....

Accordingly, if the Church and the Fathers can judge rightly about the true sense of the Holy Scriptures, they ought to be able to judge concerning the literary genre of the sacred books.

16. L. Turrado dealt with the argument presented in this number, *Valoración del testimonio patristico al atribuir un libro sagrado a determinado hagiógrafo*: EstBibl 8 (1949) 287-308.

261. *The Magisterium of the Church in this matter also has taken a position:* on the nature of the gospel of John (D 3416-3418; EB 207-209 [200-202]), on the prophecy of Isaiah (D 3505f.; EB 291f. [287f.]), on the first chapters of Genesis (D 3512-3519; EB 336-343 [332-339]), and recently the letter to Cardinal Suhard (EB 577-581; D 3862-3864), on the Psalms (D 3528; EB 351 [347]), on the first gospel (D 3566f.; EB 393f. [406f.]), on the second and third gospels (D 3576; EB 403 [416]), on the Acts of the Apostles (D 3585f.; EB 410f. [423f.]). This surely is a sign that the questions about the literary genre of the sacred books is wholly contained within the area of the Magisterium of the Church, and so of the Fathers; unless someone wishes to say that the sacred books or large parts of them are concerned with a completely profane argument; but no one has said this.

262. Therefore we deduce the intimate nature of this authority of the Church and of the Fathers *from the extrinsic connection* of the sense of Scripture with the literary genre of each book. Also it helps very much to remember that in order to argue *dogmatically* from the Fathers it is necessary to have their unanimous consent, in the matter that they explain as dogmatic, or as necessarily connected with dogma.

263. *On the authority of the Fathers in determining the messianic places in the O.T.* Since the messiahship of the places of the O.T. pertains entirely to prefiguring and foretelling the image of the Messiah, and so pertains to the fundamental dogmas of the religion, or at least to the things which are intimately connected with the fundamental dogmas, it cannot be denied that the dogmatic authority of the Fathers in determining and expounding those places can be rightly exercised, and de facto was so exercised.¹⁷

Therefore, if the Fathers agree unanimously, so that they consider a passage to be messianic, the passage will have to be considered messianic, at least in a typical way. But this does not prevent the Fathers from developing different *interpretations* of the texts, v.gr., on Isa. 53:7 (see *On Revelation* n.623), which means we do not have to accept them, since they are diverse and do not have a *unanimous* consensus.

264. IV. *The meaning of the Church is known also from the agreement of a doctrine with other revealed doctrines or from the analogy of faith*¹⁸;

17. See the treatise *On Christian Revelation* n.576 and note 6; and note that the legitimacy of the apologetic argumentation is based on the prophecies in the teaching of the N.T. and is connected with the faith.

18. See on this name Rom. 12:6: *if prophecy, according to the nature* (ἀναλογίαν) of faith.

“for, seeing that the same God is the author both of the Sacred Books and of the doctrine committed to the Church, it is clearly impossible that any teaching can by legitimate means be extracted from the former, which shall in any respect be at variance with the latter. Hence it follows that all interpretation is foolish and false which either makes the second writers disagree one with another, or is opposed to the doctrine of the Church” (*“Providentissimus”*: EB 109 [94]; D 3283).¹⁹

On the opposition falsely thought to exist between the facts narrated in Scripture and the Church’s dogmas, consult the condemned *propositions of the Modernists* (D 3423f.; EB 214f. [207]).

265. On this agreement St. Augustine said: “But when the words seem to make Scripture ambiguous, the first thing to do is to see whether a false distinction or pronounciation has been made. Therefore if after paying careful study it remains uncertain, he will examine how it should be distinguished and how it should be pronounced; *then let him consult the rule of faith, which he can find in the clearer places in Scripture and in the authority of the Church....*”²⁰

266. V. On the authority of interpreters. “The study of Scripture has always continued to advance in the Church, and, therefore, these commentaries also have their own honorable place, and are serviceable in many ways for the refutation of assailants and the explanation of difficulties. But it is most unbecoming to pass by, in ignorance or contempt, the excellent work which Catholics have left in abundance, and to have recourse to the works of non-Catholics—and to seek in them, to the detriment of sound doctrine and often to the peril of faith, the explanation of passages on which Catholics long ago have successfully employed their talent and their labor. For although the studies of non-Catholics, used with prudence, may sometimes be of use to the Catholic student, he should, nevertheless, bear well in mind—as the Fathers also teach in numerous passages²¹—that the sense of Holy Scripture can nowhere be found incorrupt outside of the Church, and cannot be expected to be found in writers who, being without the true faith, only gnaw the bark of the Sacred Scripture, and never attain its pith”²² (*“Providentissimus”*: EB 113 [98]).

19. See Fillion, *L'étude de la Bible*, letter XIV* (on the utility of Holy Scripture for the study of Theology) p.789ff.

20. *De doctrina christiana* 3,2: ML 34,65.

21. See Clement of Alex., *Stromata* 7,16; Origen, *De principiis* 4,8; *In Lev.* hom.4,8; Tertullian, *De praescriptione* 15f.; St. Hilary, *In Matt.* 13,1.

22. St. Gregory the Great, *Moral.* 20,9 al.11: ML 76,149.

CHAPTER III

On the values of Holy Scripture

267. After the dogmatic consideration, it will not be out of place for us, since we learn from life, to present a *kerygmatic* consideration of Holy Scripture (see the *Introduction to Theology* n.19), by treating the values or usefulness of the sacred Books.

And first of all, in order to begin with the more external aspect, a few things will be said about their literary value.

ARTICLE I

ON THE LITERARY VALUES

268. It has been pointed out, as we said in n.184, that in writing history the Hebrews easily surpass the historical writing skill of their contemporaries. But this is not the place to consider the individual sacred books or their various genres; nor can we list all of them, whether historical and didactic, whether prophetic and poetical: so let it suffice in general to indicate how these books whether because of the color of the narrative or because of the vividness and abundance of examples, whether because of literary beauty and artistry, have stimulated the literary inspiration of many authors and have strongly influenced their style and form of writing.¹

And "indeed, all those who have a right to speak agree that there is in the Holy Scripture an eloquence that is wonderfully varied and rich, and worthy of great themes. This St. Augustine thoroughly understood and has abundantly set forth.² This also is confirmed by the best preachers of all ages, who have gratefully acknowledged that they owed their repute chiefly to the assiduous use of the Bible, and to devout meditation on its pages" (*"Providentissimus"*: EB 87 [72]).

269. *Donoso Cortés* in his famous dissertation reflected on these books as outstanding examples of literary and poetical inspiration.³ In it, after some long period sentences (as usual) about the literary influence and beauty of these books, he considers the religious meaning, and also the sense of the

1. V.gr. in Bl. John of Avila, Fr. Luis de Granada, Fr. Alonso de Cabrera, Fr. Luis de León, whose words reveal the influence of Semitism; likewise in Racine (*Athalie*, *Esther*)... etc.

2. *De doctrina christiana* 4,6,9: ML 34,92f.

3. *La Biblia*. Discurso de recepción en la Real Academia Española (1848).

love of women and of the fatherland, which are contained in the Bible, and he compares them with similar meanings and affections which are found elsewhere. He sees the history of the people of Israel as a tragic drama, in which three phases are found: promise, threat and catastrophe.⁴

ARTICLE II

THE SUPERNATURAL VALUES IN HOLY SCRIPTURE⁵

270. From Holy Scripture itself the usefulness and efficacy of the sacred books are abundantly clear.

For, *St. Paul* said to Timothy, to whom he recommended that *he attend to the public reading of the Scripture* (1 Tim. 4:13), which Timothy knew from his childhood, *that they are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus* (2 Tim. 3:15), and that *all Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching* [certainly for sacred preaching, reading, study groups...], for reproof [if errors must be corrected], *for training in righteousness* [if someone is directing others in the spiritual life], *that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work* (2 Tim. 3:16f.).

271. For, in Holy Scripture there is a light shining on all the paths of life; and concerning it this is surely true: *Thy word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my path* (Ps. 119:105), and in it *We have the prophetic word made more sure. You will do well to pay attention to this as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star rises in your hearts* (2 Pet. 1:19).

272. Moreover, in Scripture there is COMFORT during this mortal life; "for whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction, *that by steadfastness and by the encouragement of the Scriptures we might have hope*" (Rom. 15:4). And therefore *how sweet are thy words to my taste, sweeter than honey to my mouth* (Ps. 119:103); and *I rejoice at thy word like one who finds great spoil* (Ps. 119:13); but the Jews were said to glory in the fact that *we have as encouragement the holy books which are*

4. Concerning this literary aspect of the sacred books one can consult L.-Ct. Fillion, *L'étude de la Bible. Lettres d'un professeur d'Écriture sainte à un jeune prêtre* (Paris 1922) letter IX p.47-54; E. Kalt, *Werkbuch der Bible* 1 (Freiburg im Br. 1941) p.1ff.: Die Bibel ist das bedeutendste Buch der Weltliteratur; M. Vigouroux, *Manuel biblique* (Paris 1905ff.) 1 n.6.

5. Iac. Bonfrerius wrote about the effects of Holy Scripture, *In totam Scripturam sacram praeloquia* c.11: Migne, *Cursus Scripturae* 1,133-137. See also Fillion, *L' de la Bible* lettres X^e and XI^e p.55-66.

in our hands (1 Macc. 12:9).

273. Therefore there is nothing surprising concerning the *efficacy of the Word of God*, because, as St. Paul teaches, *the word of God is living and active, sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing to the division of soul and spirit, of joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intentions of the heart* (Heb. 4:12). And the words given by God *are like fire, says the Lord, and a hammer which breaks the rock in pieces* (Jer. 23:29; see Isa. 49:2). And to this can be applied also these words of the Lord: *For as the rain and the snow come down from heaven, and return not thither but water the earth, making it bring forth and sprout, giving seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall my word be that goes forth from my mouth; it shall not return to me empty, but it shall accomplish that which I purpose, and prosper in the thing for which I sent it* (Isa. 55:10f.).

274. The holy Fathers also extol the same values of the sacred Books.

Thus St. Augustine: "*A man speaks more or less wisely as he is more or less proficient in the Holy Scriptures*. I am not saying to read them at length and commit them to memory, but to understand them well, and carefully to investigate their meaning. For, there are those who read them and neglect them; they read to retain, but they fail to understand. Doubtless by far are to be preferred to them those who retain fewer words but they see the heart of the words with the eyes of their own heart. But he is better than both of them, who both when he wishes can repeat them and also has the necessary understanding."⁶

St. Chrysostom often speaks about the excellence of the Holy Scriptures.⁷

275. But St. Jerome is effusive and boundless in his praise of Holy Scripture: "For if according to the Apostle Paul (1 Cor, 1:24), Christ is the power of God and the wisdom of God; and anyone who does not know Scripture does not know the power of God and his wisdom: *ignorance of Scripture is ignorance of Christ*."⁸ And elsewhere: "Therefore whoever is very strong in disputation, and *has been fortified with the testimonies of the sacred Scriptures, he is a defender of the Church*."⁹ "If there is anything, Paula and Eustochium, that preserves a wise man in this life, and *helps him to maintain a peaceful soul amidst the pressures and trial of this world, I think it is above everything else meditation on and knowledge of the Scriptures....*"¹⁰ And in the Rules for monks:

6. *De doctrina christiana* 4,5: ML 34,92. See also *De sacrarum Scripturarum praesantia Augustinianae margaritae*: VerDom 10 (1930) 3-5, 33-35, 65-66, 97-99, 129-131.161f.

7. V.gr., in *hom.1 in Matt.*: MG 57,14-23.

8. *Prolog. in Isa.*: ML 24,17.

9. *In Isa. 54:12*: ML 24,544,

10. *Prolog. in Eph.*: ML 26,467.

“Love knowledge of the Scriptures and you will not love the sins of the flesh.”¹¹

276. From the letters of the same *Jerome* we are selecting a few other testimonies: “Sleep overtakes the one holding the codex, and *the holy page receives the drooping face.*”¹² “Often read the divine Scriptures, indeed *never let the sacred reading slip from your hands.* Learn what you teach, search for that which speaks faithfully according to the doctrine; so that you may be able to exhort others in sacred doctrine and convert those opposing it... When you are teaching in Church, do not seek the praise of the people but their sorrow. The tears of the auditors are your praises. *The conversation of a priest should be based on the reading of the Scriptures.*”¹³ And again: “Since you were educated by the divine Scriptures and you know their laws and testimonies in the bond of truth; when you contend with adversaries, you will bind them and lead them conquered into captivity; and *of those formerly miserable you will make them free children of God, so that suddenly you will say with Zion:* I was bereaved and barren, exiled and put away, but who has brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; whence then have these come? (Isa. 49:21).”¹⁴ “*Love the holy Scripture and wisdom will love you; love her and she will serve you; honor her and she will embrace you.*”¹⁵

277. St. Ambrose wrote a beautiful letter to a newly-appointed bishop: “You have assumed the office of the priesthood and standing at the helm of the Church you steer the ship across the waves. Hold on to the key of faith, so that the violent storms of this world cannot upset you... *The sea is the divine Scripture, having in itself profound meanings and the heights of the prophetic mysteries; many rivers flow into that sea. Therefore there are sweet and clear rivers; and there are snowy fountains springing up to eternal life; there are also good discourses like the honey of the honeycomb; there are charming sentences which irrigate the minds of the auditors with a spiritual drink and charm them with the sweetness of the moral precepts. Therefore there are different streams of the divine Scriptures.* You have a first drink, you have a second drink, you have the last drink.”¹⁶

278. And St. Gregory the Great not less spiritually and elegantly: “... *For anyone who prepares himself for the words of true preaching, it is necessary that he take the sources of his argument from the sacred pages, so that everything he says is based on the foundation of divine authority and that he establishes the structure of his words on it....*”¹⁷ “But all of this is done properly by the priest, if being inspired by a spirit of heavenly fear and love, *he meditates daily on the precepts of the sacred sayings; so that*

11. *Regula Monachorum* 14: ML 30,364. It is very worthwhile to read this chapter 14: on contemplation, prayer and reading.

12. *Epist.* 22 (to Eustochium) 17: ML 22,404.

13. *Epist.* 52 (to Nepotianus) 7f.: ML 22,533f.

14. *Epist.* 78 (to Fabiola) 28 al.30: ML 22,714f.

15. *Epist.* 130 (to Demetrius) 20: ML 22,1124. In general, you can read the recommendations of St. Jerome regarding the study of Holy Scripture in “*Spiritus Paraclitus*” (EB 480f. [493f.]).

16. *Epist.* 2 (to Constantius) 1-4: ML 16,879f.

17. *Moral.* 18,26 al.14: ML 76,58.

the words of divine admonition may restore in him the thoughts of anxiety and move him to the heavenly life of prudent circumspection, which the experience of human intercourse incessantly tends to destroy.”¹⁸ And elsewhere to a certain doctor: “*But what is Holy Scripture except a letter from almighty God to his creature?* And certainly if someone lived at a distant place and received a letter from an earthly emperor, he would not stop, he would not rest, he would not give sleep to his eyes, unless he had first acknowledged what the earthly emperor had written to him. The emperor of heaven, the Lord of men and angels, for the sake of your life has sent his letters to you, and still, glorious son, you ardently neglect to read the same letters. Be zealous therefore, I beseech you, and meditate daily on the words of your Creator. *Learn to know the heart of God in God’s words*, that you may strive more eagerly for eternal things, that your mind may be set on fire with more fervent desires for heavenly joys.”¹⁹

279. The Sovereign Pontiffs, especially the more recent ones, agree with the preceding praises of the Fathers for the sacred Writings, and their encouragements to read them.

Thus, Leo XIII in his *Encyclical “Providentissimus,”* where he expounds the use which Jesus Christ himself and the Apostles of the sacred Writings (EB 84f. [69f.]), goes on to say: “The purpose of God in giving the scripture to men is shown by the example of Christ our Lord and of his Apostles... Let the novices of the ecclesiastical army understand how deeply the sacred Books should be esteemed, and with what eagerness and reverence they should approach this great arsenal of heavenly arms. For those whose duty it is to handle Catholic doctrine before the learned or the unlearned will nowhere find more ample matter or more abundant exhortation, whether on the subject of God, the supreme Good and the all-perfect Being, or of the works which display his glory and his love...” (EB 86 [71]).

And elsewhere in the same *Encyclical*: “For those who infuse into their efforts the spirit and strength of the Word of God speak *not in word only but in power also, and in the Holy Ghost and in much fullness* [see 1 Thess. 1:5]. Hence those preachers are foolish and improvident who, in speaking of religion and proclaiming the things of God, use no words but those of human science and human prudence, trusting to their own reasonings rather than to those of God...” (EB 87 [72]). And also: “Most desirable is it, and most essential, that the whole teaching of theology should be pervaded and animated by use of the divine Word of God. This is what the Fathers and the greatest theologians of all ages have desired and reduced to practice...” (EB 114 [99]).

280. Benedict XV in the *Encyclical “Spiritus Paraclitus”*: “And none can fail to see what profit and sweet tranquility must result in well-disposed souls from such devout reading of the Bible. Whosoever come to it in piety, faith and humility, and with determination to make progress in it, will assuredly find therein and will eat *the bread*

18. *Regula pastoral.* 2,11 al.22: ML 77,48.

19. *Epist.* 4,31 (to Theodore, a physician): ML 77,706 A.

that comes down from heaven [see John 6:33]; he will, in his own person, experience the truth of David's words: *The hidden and uncertain things of thy Wisdom thou hast made manifest to me* [Ps. 51:8]..." (EB 476 [489]).

And the same Pontiff explains in memory of St. Jerome, "We learn from his example and teaching the qualities required in one who would devote himself to biblical study." Certainly, "*In the first place, that from the Bible's pages we learn spiritual perfection...*" (EB 482 [495]). "Secondly, *it is from the Bible that we gather confirmation and illustration of any particular doctrine we wish to defend...*" (EB 483 [496]). "*Lastly, the real value of the Bible is for our preaching—if the letter is to be fruitful...*" (EB 484 [497]), and he explains how this is to be done in what follows.²⁰

The same Benedict XV also spoke about the "sweet fruits" Jerome gathered from the "bitter seed of literature" from the knowledge of the Scriptures. Certainly he gained, among other things, joy and love of the Church, zeal for truth and the purity of morals, love also for Christ and imitation of him (EB 488-493 [501]).²¹

281. Pius XII, among other things, said this: "Let priests therefore, who are bound by their office to procure the eternal salvation of the faithful, after they have themselves by diligent study pursued the sacred pages and made them their own by prayer and meditations, assiduously distribute the heavenly treasures of the divine word by sermons, homilies and exhortations; let them confirm the Christian doctrine by sentences from the Sacred Books and illustrate it by outstanding examples from sacred history and in particular from the Gospel of Christ our Lord..." ("*Divino afflante*": EB 566).

In the same letter the Pontiff speaks later on about Jesus, who is the foundation which cannot be replaced by any other: "*This author of salvation, Christ, will men more fully know, more ardently love and faithfully imitate in proportion as they are more assiduously urged to know and meditate on the Sacred Letters, especially the New Testament...*" ("*Divino afflante*": EB 568).

282. Ascetical authors. The preceding eulogies and recommendations should not seem to be something surprising. For, the Church has always been convinced, especially the ascetical authors, about the usefulness of spiritual reading of the sacred pages; since, "truth is to be sought for in Holy Scripture, not eloquence."²²

"For in this life I find there are two things especially necessary for me, without which this miserable life would be insupportable. Whilst I am kept in the prison of this body I acknowledge myself to need two things, namely, food and light. Thou hast therefore given to me, weak as I am, thy sacred Body, for the nourishment of my soul and

20. On the use of the sacred Books for preaching, see Cardinal I. Gomá, *La Biblia y la predicación* (Barcelona 1927); N. García, C.M.F., *La predicación y los predicadores* (Madrid 1941), especially p. 52-54; C. Bayle, S.J., *La predicación sagrada según los documentos pontíficos y doctrina de los Santos Padres*² (Barcelona 1933); H. Höpfel, *Écriture sainte, V. L'Écriture sainte et la prédication*: DBS 2,472-475. Jerome Nadal, S.J., wrote very well about the nature of *sacred reading*, *Adhortatio* 6.^a in *Monum. Hist. S.J., Epist. Nadal* 4,659-661.

21. Reverently and piously reading and learning Holy Scripture was treated by the Letter of the Sacred Congregation for Seminaries and Universities sent to the Reverent Bishops on January 25, 1924: EC 1181f.

22. *The Imitation of Christ*, Book 1, ch. 5: On reading the Holy Scriptures.

body, and thou has set *Thy word as a lamp to my feet* [Ps. 119:105]. Without these two I could not well live, for the word of God is the light of my soul and thy Sacrament is the bread of life. These also may be called the two tables set on either side in the storehouse of thy holy Church. One is the table of the holy altar after having the holy bread, that is, the precious Body of Christ; the other is that of the divine law, containing thy holy doctrine, teaching the right faith, and firmly leading even within the veil, where is the holy of holies."²³

283. For the sacred Scripture is a *certain theophany*, that is, a manifestation of God to us, since it is the word of God sent to us. Hence *analogically* it can be compared with the theophany which took place in the Incarnation of the Word of God; and as we say about this in the Preface of the Nativity, giving thanks "because *the brightness of your glory has made itself manifest to the eyes of our mind* by the mystery of the word made flesh, and we are drawn to the love of things unseen through him whom we acknowledge as God, now seen by men": we can say the same thing, making the necessary adjustments, with regard to Holy Scripture. Indeed that which we reverence as incarnated in the mystery of the Nativity is the *personal* Word of God, the second Person of the Blessed Trinity, who by assuming to himself personally a human nature has become like the face of God, in which we can know God: of course this written word of God is not the personal Word of God, but it is the speaking and communication of God going outside himself, which is a work of the whole Blessed Trinity (although appropriated to the Holy Spirit); but this speaking and this word, *analogically* to the Incarnation of the personal Word of God, has donned a written and sensible form, *by which the brightness of the divine glory has made itself manifest to the eyes of our mind, that through this visible form we may be drawn to the love of things unseen.*²⁴

23. *The Imitation of Christ*, Book 4, ch. 11, n.4.

24. G.E. Closen, S.J., wrote *about the Holy Scripture and the life of prayer of Christians*: VerDom 22 (1942) 103-116. Likewise H. Höpfl, *Ecriture sainte*. VI *L'Ecriture sainte et l'Ascèse*: DBS 2,475-479.

ARTICLE III

ON THE READING OF HOLY SCRIPTURE

Since there are so many values found in the Bible, there is a strong inclination to read it. Now several things should be said about this reading¹:

284. I. *The reading of the Bible is regulated by the Church.* For, the reading of Holy Scripture, although it is very useful, is *not necessary for all without making any distinctions*. Indeed the total reading of all the Scriptures for youths is considered also by some Protestants *as not lacking a certain danger*.

The Church by regulating such reading, *while she encourages reverence for the word of God*, wanted to prevent a dangerous *subjectivism in the private interpretation of individual readers*; at the same time she reminds us *that the ultimate norm of faith is the authentic and living Magisterium of the Church*.

De facto the free reading of the Bible was and is the cause of division among the Protestant sects; and, while this was the cause in Protestantism, especially in the liberal groups, of casting into oblivion their divine character, this free reading did not increase the love of Holy Scripture, but rather diminished it.

Hence it is not surprising if the *errors of Pasquier Quesnel* on this matter were condemned with various condemnations by Clement XI in the year 1713 (D 2480-2485). Similar *errors of the Synod of Pistoia* were condemned (D 2667f.).

285. II. *The Church never in a general way forbade the reading of Holy Scripture.* For, the sacred books *were always frequently used for the liturgical reading* in the Mass and the Divine Office; indeed, it was also recommended *for the private reading of monks and others* (also nuns), as various synods and monastic rules directed.

Therefore it is not surprising if they are found in such abundance in the ecclesiastical libraries of the Middle Ages, and have been published so often since the invention of printing.

286. III. *The Church at times restricted the reading of Holy Scripture in the vernacular languages.*² This was done in the synods of Toulouse (1229), Tarragona (1234) and Oxford (1408).

According to the *Index of Paul IV* (1559) reading of the Bible depended on permission from the Roman Inquisition; but shortly thereafter, according to *the fourth rule of Trent*, in the *Index of Pius IV* (1564), anyone could receive permission from his Bishop or the inquisitor at the recommendation of his pastor or confessor.

According to the *Index of Sixtus V*, the Apostolic See gave permission; again, ac-

1. About the next three points to be made A. Stonner has something to say briefly in: LTK 2,290-292.

2. On this point, see G. Duncker, O.P., *La Chiesa e le version della S. Scrittura in lingua volgare*: Ang 24 (1947) 140-167; J. Encino, *Prohibiciones españolas de las versiones bíblicas en romance antes del Tridentino*: EstBibl 3 (1944) 523-560.

cording to the *Index of Clement VIII* (1596) the approval of the Roman Inquisition was required.

Gradually, however, permission was given for every approved translation, and *Benedict XIV* (1757) permitted the approved versions containing notes from the holy Fathers.

Gregory XVI published the decrees of Trent and of *Clement VIII*; but *Leo XIII* (1897) made his own without restrictions the norms given by *Benedict XIV* (see EB¹ 124).

Recent directives of *Canon Law*, requiring for versions in the vernacular language notes and at least the permission of a bishop, are given in canon 1391 [1917]. See also cn. 1399,1, forbidding editions and versions of the sacred books produced by non-Catholics; the use of them "is permitted only for those who are involved in some way in theological or biblical studies, provided that the same books have been edited faithfully and completely, and that the dogmas of the Catholic faith are not attacked in their introductions or notes" (cn. 1400).

287. IV. The Church recommends the reading of Holy Scripture also in the vernacular language.³ Thus *Benedict XV* in the *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"* recommended the daily reading of Holy Scripture, following the example of St. Jerome, who also urged mothers and virgins to do such reading (EB 475 [488]); and in the same place is praised the proposal "to put into the hands of as many people as possible the Gospels and Acts, so that every Christian family may have them and become accustomed to reading them..." (EB 478 [491]).

And in the same Letter, a little further on, he says: "... commendation is due to Catholics in other countries who have published the entire New Testament, as well as selected portions of the Old, in neat and simple form so as to popularize their use; hence much more fruit must accrue to the Church of God..." (EB 479 [492]).⁴

St. Pius X strongly approved the sodality of St. Jerome, which promoted the habit of reading and meditating on the holy Gospels (see "*Divino afflante*": EB 543).

Pius XII in the *Encyclical "Divino afflante"* said: "Let them [Bishops] favor therefore and lend help to those pious associations whose aim it is to spread copies of the Gospels, among the faithful, and to procure by every means that in Christian families the same be read daily with piety and devotion; let them efficaciously recommend by word and example, whenever the liturgical laws permit, the Sacred Scriptures translated, with the approval of the ecclesiastical authority, into modern languages..." (EB 566; see also *ibid.*, 549-566ff.).

288. Therefore it is not surprising if today among Catholics the use of "Bible Study Groups" has become more common, where young persons especially and also others comment on the sacred text, mainly the Gospels, whereby they can come to know and love

3. See E. Kalt, *Werkbuch der Bibel* 1 p.23: Die Kirche wünscht die Lesung der hl.Schrift.

4. See also *ibid.*, EB 476f. [489f.]. There is a special recommendation for clerics, *ibid.*, EB 480 [493]. The indulgences granted for the reading of Holy Scripture are found in *Enchir. Indulg.* 694.

more effectively the written word of God and so also the incarnate Word of God... Nor is it surprising if, also with the approval and the encouragement of the ecclesiastical authority, popular magazines on the Bible are published and widely distributed.⁵

289. V. On how to read Holy Scripture.⁶ Books are not understood except in the spirit in which they are written. Therefore "All Holy Scripture ought to be read with that spirit with which it was made. We must rather seek for profit in the Scriptures than for subtlety of speech."⁷ And the sacred books are not *fully* understood except in the Holy Spirit, that is, with the help of the grace of God dwelling in a man and assisting him.

These words of *Leo XIII* look at this necessity of the life of grace and of prayer: "For the Sacred Scripture is not like other books. Dictated by the Holy Spirit, it contains things of the deepest importance, which in many instances are most difficult and obscure. To understand and explain such things there is always required the "coming" of the same Holy Spirit⁸; that is to say, his light and his grace; and these, as the Royal Psalmist so frequently insists, are to be sought by humble prayer and guarded by holiness of life" ("*Providentissimus*": EB 89 [74]). See also "*Spiritus Paraclitus*" (EB 469 [482]).

290. For praxis: 1) Read Holy Scripture *with that reverence* with which the Church listens to the reading of the Gospel in a Solemn Mass. But *Leo XIII* does not tire in recommending reverence and piety to anyone who wants to approach the sacred Writings:

"Finally, We admonish with paternal love all students and ministers of the Church always to approach the sacred Writings with reverence and piety; for it is impossible to attain to the profitable understanding thereof unless the arrogance of "earthly" science be laid aside, and there be excited in the heart the holy desire for that wisdom "which is from above" [see James 3:15-17]..." ("*Providentissimus*": EB 134 [119]).

291. 2) Listen to the Lord *speaking to you*, as Mary Magdalen at the feet of Jesus listened to him speaking to her.

292. 3) *St. Jerome* proposed a *study plan* to Laeta for the instruction of her daughter: "Let her give you a report each day on what she has learned from the Scriptures... In the place of jewels and fine clothes may she love the divine Codices... First of all, let her learn the Psalter; let her devote herself to these songs, and let her be schooled in the Proverbs of Solomon for her way of living. From Ecclesiastes let her be accustomed to despise worldly things. In Job let her follow his examples of virtue and patience. *When*

5. V.gr., *Cultura biblica* (Madrid), *Revista biblica* (Montevideo), *Bibel und Liturgie* (Klosterneuburg, Vienna).

6. Fillion also treats this matter, *L'étude de la Bible* lettres XIX^{ff}.

7. *The Imitation of Christ*, Book 1, ch. 5.

8. St. Jerome, *In Mich.* 1:10; ML 25,1215 C.

she moves on to the Gospels she should never let them out of her hands. With the total will of her heart let her imbibe the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. When she has filled up the storeroom of her breast with these works, let her commit to memory the Prophets, the Heptateuch, the books both of Kings and of Chronicles, and also the volumes of Ezra and Esther. Lastly, without danger let her learn the Canticle of Canticles: lest if she should read it at the beginning, under the carnal words, not understanding the nuptial song of a spiritual marriage, she be wounded...."⁹

293. 4) But it is fitting, besides other methods, especially for clerics,¹⁰ to join together a more accurate reading and study of the sacred books *with the liturgical cycle and the liturgical feasts*: so that those books and those pericopes (surely with greater amplitude) then are read more carefully, which corresponds with the liturgy and the current readings in the Divine Office. For although in this matter it is difficult to establish a norm and rule for everyone, the method explained seems to have the following advantages:

a) Such feasts and liturgical occasions offer first of all *pericopes that are especially chosen from the Holy Bible by the Church*; and these, since they are short and *associated with some concrete spiritual "interest,"* offer a greater opportunity of penetrating the mind, and, what is more important, penetrating the heart.¹¹

b) Thus anyone may admit a twofold magisterium better than others, while he truly joins together *the divine magisterium of the sacred books with the administration of the ordinary ecclesiastical magisterium*, which is proposed through the holy liturgy,

c) The striving to join meditation on the sacred books with the spirit and the occasion of a liturgical feast *is very ancient in the Church of God*; and, in order to offer some proof of this, it was strongly recommended by St. Ignatius Loyola and his disciples.¹²

d) In this way a person can more easily not only *study* the sacred books, but also *pray* with them; so that, while he asks the Lord to open the Scriptures for himself, he has the feeling of the two disciples: *Did not our hearts burn within us, while... he opened to us the Scriptures?* (Luke 24:32).

9. *Epist.* 107 (to Laeta) 9,12: ML 22,875-877; EB 488. In general on St. Jerome and the reading of Scripture, see Denys George, *La lectio divina des origines du cénobitisme à S. Benoît et Cassiodore t.1: Saint Jérôme et la lecture sacrée* (Paris 1929). St. Jerome's recommendations for clerics regarding sacred studies, especially that of Holy Scripture, were developed by Benedict XV in the *Encyclical "Spiritus Paraclitus"*: EB 480f. [493f.].

On the mind of Bl. John of Avila concerning the reading of Holy Scripture, see J. Leal, S.J., *El studio de la S.Escritura en el B. Juan de Avila: Maestro Avila* (Montilla-Córdoba) 1 (1946) 31-37; I. Gomá Civit, *Un texto inédito del B. J. de Avila sobre el studio de la S.Escritura*: EstBibl 2 (1943) 107-119.

10. The *Instructio Commissionis de re biblica* (May 13, 1950; EB 592, 601, 607) treats *the daily and continued reading of Holy Scripture* in the seminaries for priests and in the colleges of Religious

11. And it will not be difficult for clerics periodically to use a Psalm for meditation, so that later the reading and prayer in the Divine Office can be not only a *recitation*, but also something *touching the heart*.

12. See M. Nicolau, S.J., *Liturgia y Ejercicios*, especially in § III-IV: Manr 20 (1948) 257ff.; and by the same author, *Jerónimo Nadal. Sus obras y doctrinas espirituales* (Madrid 1949) 189-199.

e) Thus finally, just as the Liturgy, the public worship of the Church, has Christ as its center; so also the reading of Scripture makes Christ its center of attention.

294. This is exactly what St. Jerome praised. "For in the books of both Testaments Jerome saw the Church of God foretold"; and "*again and again Jerome celebrates the intimate union between Christ and his Church*. For since the Head can never be separated from the mystical body, so, too, love of Christ is ever associated with zeal of his Church; and this love of Christ must ever be the chiefest and most agreeable result of a knowledge of Holy Scripture....*Every single page of either Testament seems to center around Christ*; hence Jerome, commenting on the words of the Apocalypse about the River and the Tree of Life, says: 'One stream flows out from the throne of God, and that is the Grace of the Holy Spirit, and that Grace of the Holy Spirit is in the Holy Scriptures, that is the stream of the Scriptures. Yet *that stream has twin banks*, the Old Testament and the New, *and the Tree planted on either side is Christ*'"¹³ ("*Spiritus Paraclitus*": EB 489-491 [502-504]).

13. *Tract. in Ps 1*: Anect. Mareds 3,2,6: EB 491 [504].

INDEX OF SCRIPTURE

N.B. The Roman numerals designate the *treatise* and the Arabic the *marginal* numbers.

Gen	2,24	IV 246	Judg	6,12-16	III 300
	7,2	III 481	1 Sam	16	III 1306
	7,13	III 481	2 Sam	5,1-3	III 222
	7,23	III 481		5,2	III 224
	12,3	III 48		23,2	IV 25
	16,5	III 187	1 Kings	8,22	III 150
	17,10	III 85		19,16	III 1306
	18,18	III 48	Job	38,17	III 303
	22,18	III 48	Ps	1	III 315
	26,4	III 48		2,6-8	III 132
	26,24	III 300		2,7	IV 209
	28,14	III 48		2,8	III 48 1174
	28,15	III 300		9,15	III 303
	32,28	III 187		17,9	IV 202
	35,9	III 187		21,28	III 1174
Exod	3,11-17	III 300 521		40,30f	III 230
	5,4	III 324		44,2	IV 135
	17,14	IV 25		46,2	III 48
	17,27	IV 25		46,2f	III 61
	19,24	III 85		43,3	III 48
	20,8	III 85		46,8	III 48
	24,5-8	III 86		46,8f	III 61
	24,8	III 87		46,9	III 48
	25-27	III 85		71	III 1173
	31,12	III 85		71,1-2	III 48
Lev	8-9	III 1306		71,7	III 1173
Num	20,4	III 150		71,8	III 48 1173
Deut	4,2	III 963		71,9	III 1173
	12,32	III 963		71,11	III 48 1173
	18,15-19	III 1306		71,12	III 1173
	18,18-19	III 132		71,15	III 1173
	25,4	IV 221		71,17	III 1173
	31,23	III 300		71,18	III 48 1173
Josh	1,5	III 300 521		71,20	III 48 1173
	1,9	III 300 521		104,8-10	III 323
	3,7	III 300 521		108	IV 126

	109	III 1306		23,1-8	III 222
	109,1	III 77		23,29	IV 273
	109,4	III 132		30,10f	III 300
	110,5-9	III 323		31,31	III 84
	118,103	IV 272		32,33f	III 534
	118,105	IV 271		36,17f	IV 25
	118,162	IV 272		36,18	IV 135
	131	III 228		42,11	III 300
Wis	16,13	III 303		46,28	III 300
Sir	50,1	III 362	Ezek	34	III 222
	50,6	III 362		34,2-5	III 222
	50,7	III 362		34,2	III 222
Isa	2,2	III 1174		34,4	III 222
	2,2-4	III 46 61		34,8	III 222
	6,3	III 1182		34,9-11	III 222
	8,1	IV 25		34,15f	III 222
	9,6-7	III 192		34,22-24	III 222
	22,15-22	III 192		34,29-31	III 222
	22,22	III 192	Dan	2,35	III 48 1174
	30,8	IV 25		2,44	III 48 61
	35	III 1306		4,23	III 315
	38,10	III 303		7,13	III 52 77
	41,10-16	III 300		7,13f	III 133
	43,1-5	III 300		7,14	III 1174
	49,14-16	III 323		7,27	III 48
	53,4	IV 209		12,3	III 362
	53,8	III 841; IV 209	Mic	5,2-4	III 223
	54,13	III 533	Hag	2,2f	IV 25
	54,17	III 237	Zech	9,10	III 1174
	55,3	III 84	Mal	1,11	III 48 61 1174
	55,10f	IV 273		2,7	III 362
	62,2	III 237		3,1	III 362
Jer	1,4-8	III 300	Matt	1,1-4,16	III 13
	1,8	III 521		1,1-16,12	III 13
	1,9	IV 143		1,21	III 56 922
	1,18	III 521		2,1-6	III 223
	1,18f	III 300		2,11	III 1173
	1,19	III 300 521		2,15	IV 195
	15,20	III 300		4,17	III 36 46 58 105
	19,10	III 314		4,17-9,35	III 13

Matt	4,23	III 46	8,19-20	III 99
	5,1-48	III 15	9,1-6	III 59
	5,1-47	III 56	9,11-15	III 99
	5,3	III 37 46	9,13	III 59
	5,3-12	III 58	9,26-11,1	III 13
	5,10	III 46	10,1	III 88 100 102
	5,11ff	III 303 321	10,1-15	III 65
	5,12	III 52	10,1-42	III 15
	5,13	III 50	10,1-11,1	III 104
	5,14	III 268	10,3	III 103
	5,17	III 58 84 112	10,5	III 65
		135	10,5-7	III 105
	5,17-20	III 1189	10,5-15	III 961
	5,18	IV 27	10,6	III 84
	5,21	III 58	10,7	III 134
	5,21f	III 1189	10,9	III 961
	5,21-48	III 58	10,14	III 524
	5,27	III 58	10,15	III 524
	5,27f	III 1189	10,16-18	III 63
	5,33	III 58	10,16-31	III 303
	5,33f	III 1189	10,16-39	III 321
	5,34-37	III 799	10,16-42	III 54 65
	5,38	III 58	10,17f	III 1191
	5,38f	III 1189	10,17-28	III 951
	5,43	III 58	10,20	III 301
	5,43f	III 31 1189	10,22	III 57 1083
	5,43-45	III 58	10,23	III 41 70-72
	5,44f	III 303 321	10,24	III 99 516
	5,48	III 15 56 1193	10,24-28	III 1191
	6,9	III 995	10,27	III 63 134 695
	6,10	III 46	10,32	III 63 137
	6,12	III 58	10,37-39	III 31 57
	7,14	III 1198	10,40	III 63 105 137
	7,17-19	III 1187		354 368 517
	7,17-20	III 1265		524 641
	7,24	III 190 303	11,2-12	III 13 45
	7,29	III 516	11,10	III 362
	8,4	III 84	11,10-14	III 86
	8,10	III 85	11,12	III 53 62
	8,11	III 50 1174	11,12-24	III 53

11,13	III 47	15,11	III 85
11,27	III 42 752	15,24	III 40 64 977
12,6	III 85	15,25	III 84
12,8	III 85	16,12	III 555 709 762
12,21-28	III 53	16,13	III 50 555 762
12,25	III 1158	16,13-19	III 186-196
12,26	III 303	16,13-20	III 15
12	III 13	16,13-28	III 237
13	III 1130	16,15-17	III 199
13-17	III 104	16,15-19	III 225 235
13,4-9	III 53	16,16-19	III 181 182 183
13,9-17	III 255		184 185 233
13,10-36	III 104		269
13,11	III 37	16,17	III 203
13,18-23	III 53	16,17-19	III 161 171 175
13,19	III 46		186 207 216
13,23	III 1188		426 458
13,24	III 46	16,18	III 63 146 147
13,24-30	III 54 62 298f		173ff 175-178
	1066 1172		179 187 190
13,31	III 46 51		197 198 203
13,33	III 46		207 241 242
13,36	III 51		263 294 303f
13,36-41	III 1066		311 320 321
13,36-43	III 54 62 298f		479 480 483
	1172		605 608 640
13,38	III 46		949 950 1130
13,39	III 52 303	16,18f	III 31 241 212
13,41	III 46		260 479-485
13,43	III 46		604 612 1130
13,44	III 46 79 1143		1133 1266
13,45	III 46	16,19	III 135f 192
13,47	III 46 51		193 303 329
13,47-50	III 54 62 299		479 480 481
	1080		482 485 606
13,49	III 52		953 1319
14,28-31	III 181	16,21	III 104
14,33	III 199	16,23	III 203
15,3	III 809	16,24	III 57
15,9	III 962	16,27	III 1254

Matt	16,28	III 41 73f	22,8	III 51
	17,1-8	III 73	22,31	IV 27
	17,22	III 104	22,34-40	III 58
	17,24-47	III 181	22,37-40	III 1079 1100
	18,1	III 200	23,3	III 84
	18,1-35	III 15 54 104	23,9	III 995
	18,8	III 1064	23,10	III 532
	18,15	III 965	23,13	III 53 192
	18,15-17	III 1040	23,15	III 48
	18,15-18	III 1062	23,31f	III 224
	18,16-18	III 953	23,32-39	III 72 75
	18,17	III 146 147 949	23,38	III 85
		953	24,2	III 85
	18,17f	III 1101	24,3-36	III 54
	18,18	III 134 135 136	24,9-14	III 321
		200 255 280	24,10-13	III 324
		641 953 1049	24,13	III 1083
		1130 1319	24,14	III 46 1174
	18,20	III 43 1194	24,24	III 324
	18,23	III 46	24,25	III 104
	19,5	III 990	24,29-31	III 52
	19,12	III 472	24,34	III 41 75f
	19,16	III 84	24,36	III 78
	19,16-29	III 1189	24,36-44	III 539
	19,21	III 961	24,42-44	III 78
	19,28	III 113	25,1	III 46
	20,1	III 46	25,31-33	III 298
	20,16	III 1198	25,31-34	III 52
	20,17	III 104	25,31-40	III 31 57
	20,21	III 200	25,31-46	III 49 57
	20,23	III 160	25,34-46	III 1254
	20,1-25.46	III 14	25,46	III 298
	21,12	III 84	26-27	III 14
	21,32	III 53	26,2	III 104
	21,43	III 51 85	26,8-10	III 526
	22,1-3	III 1082	26,13	III 1163
	22,1-14	III 62	26,20	III 104
	22,2	III 46	26,26-28	III 922
	22,2-14	III 1080	26,28	III 87
	22,4	III 77	26,31	III 223 269

	26,31-35	III 215		14,9	III 1163
	26,63f	III 84 133		14,17	III 104
	26,64	III 41 48 77		14,17-20	III 101
	28	III 14		14,26	III 77
	28,16-20	III 15		14,66-72	III 235
	28,18	III 50 133 363		16,15	III 50 134 255
		555 748 922			305 561 562
		949 950 958			798 924 958
		1159 1313			1130 1159
	28,18-20	III 31 105 300		16,15-16	III 695 790
		306 348 382			1101 1171
		517 520 521		16,16	III 58 137 524
		561 562 641			531 798 1298
		1094 1171 1180			1333
		1264 1298		16,18	III 641
	28,19f	III 1189 1289		16,19-20	III 138
		113f		16,20	III 526 792
	28,20	III 300ff 363			1171
		518 695 790		Luke 1,1-4	III 797
		1098 1180 1264		1,2	III 366 769
		1301 1333		1,10	III 230
Mark	1,36	III 270		1,28-36	III 521
	3,13	III 100		1,32-33	III 192
	3,14	III 101 134		1,35	III 992
	3,16	III 101 102 180		1,45	III 1010
		270		2,4	III 977
	3,18	III 103		2,21	II 84
	4,10	III 104		2,32	III 48
	4,11	III 37		2,41	III 84
	4,34	III 104 255		2,46	III 516
	6,8	III 961		3,12	III 516
	6,50	III 180		3,32	III 992
	7,7-13	III 962		4,1	III 992
	7,7-13	III 962		4,14	III 992
	8,29	III 180		4,16-21	III 992
	9,1	III 73		5,1-10	III 215
	9,33	III 134 180		6,12	III 100 101
	9,35	III 104		6,13	III 90 254
	10,21	III 961		6,14	III 102 180 270
	13,1-3	III 104		6,15	III 103

Luke	6,17	III 99		22,25-28	III 607
	6,20	III 37		22,29-30	III 607
	6,40	III 99 516		22,31	III 269
	6,48	III 190		22,31f	III 607f 612
	7,24	III 362			1266
	8,10	III 37		22,32	III 197 198 260
	9,3	III 961			607 640 641
	9,20	III 180			1130
	9,27	III 74		22,35	III 961
	9,32	III 270		22,36	III 961
	9,52	III 362		22,69	III 77
	9,54	III 967		24,25	III 104
	10,1	III 99		24,32	IV 293
	10,4	III 961		24,34	III 182
	10,10-12	III 1101		24,39	III 564 566
	10,10-16	III 524 1159		24,44	III 86
	10,16	III 105 137 354		24,44-46	IV 27
		368 517 669		24,44-49	III 255 695
		922 1098 1101		24,46-47	III 1174
		1298 1319		24,46-49	III 749
		1333		24,47	III 67
	11,52	III 192		24,48	III 50 992
	12,12	III 301		24,49	III 992
	12,32	III 1199	John	1,4	III 60
	14,33	III 57		1,9	III 60 292 1118
	15,1-32	III 56 59			1305
	16,16	III 47 53		1,11-14	III 994
	17,20	III 1143		1,12	III 60 977
	17,20-21	III 53		1,13	III 977
	17,21	III 42 80		1,14	III 735 1316
	18,8	III 324 1199		1,17	III 1316
	18,22	III 961		1,17f	III 516
	19,10	III 56 922		1,29	III 219
	19,37-39	III 99		1,42	III 187 243
	22,14	III 104		2	III 243
	22,19	III 134		2,19	III 204
	22,19-20	III 922		3,2	III 521 514
	22,20	III 87 151		3,3	III 63
	22,24	III 607		3,3-5	III 926
	22,25	III 160		3,5	III 134 977

	992 1031 1035		925
	1096 1130;	10,11-15	III 221
	IV 244	10,14	III 264
3,10	III 516	10,14-16	III 1133
3,11-19	518	10,15	III 220
3,13-18	III 305	10,16	III 220 221 266
3,14-18	III 922 1098		312 925 1130
	1133		1158
3,16	III 1191	10,25-27	III 269
3,17	III 294	10,26	III 221
3,31-36	III 518	10,26-28	III 925
3,34	III 212	10,27	III 221
3,36	III 1098	10,17-28	III 1083
3,38-40	III 922	10,28	III 220 221
4,8	III 961	10,35	IV 27
4,23	III 81 1143	10,36	III 105
5,4	IV 176	11,50	IV 209
5,18	III 85 135	13-17	III 54
5,22	III 264	13,13	Praef.
5,39	IV 27	13,13-15	III 516
6,44f	III 533	13,16	III 90 99
6,48-50	III 1130	13,20	III 105 137
6,52-54	III 134	13,25	III 1265
6,53	III 799	13,34	III 58
6,53-58	III 926	13,34-35	III 58 1191
6,54	IV 245	14,6	III 34 1307
6,66-70	III 101		1345
6,68	III 514	14,12-14	III 1265
6,70	III 100	14,15	III 530 950
7,15-18	III 518	14,15-17	III 994
7,22	III 85	14,16	III 291 300 301
8,12	III 268		306 382 555
10,1	III 220		763 790 949
10,2	III 264		1180
10,3	III 221	14,16f	III 300ff 519
10,4	III 221		522 529 641
10,9	III 220 221		1317 1333
10,9-11	III 269 479 482	14,17	III 60 301
10,10	III 920	14,19f	III 530
10,11	III 215 260 264	14,21-24	III 58 1100

John	14,22	III 103	16,13	III 1333;
	14,23	III 60		IV 219
	14,24-26	III 748 763	16,20	III 1191
	14,25	III 529	16,22	III 530
	14,25-26	III 255 695	16,27	III 530
	14,26	III 67 291 300	16,33	III 1191
		301 306 522	17-19	III 105
		529 555 641	17,1-5	III 1160
		762 763 790	17,1-26	III 1160
		949 1180 1264	17,6-8	III 305
		1301 1317	17,6-19	III 1160
	14,28-30	III 529	17,8	III 105
	15,1-5	III 989	17,11	III 1247
	15,1-6	III 1099	17,11-16	III 78
	15,3f	III 530	17,11-20	III 312
	15,5	III 1265	17,14	III 105 305
	15,7	III 1265	17,17-19	III 305
	15,9	III 530	17,18	III 105 517
	15,9-14,17	III 58		922 1098 1180
	15,10-20	III 1191		1298 1302
	15,12-17	III 58	17,18-20	III 748
	15,14-16	III 530	17,21	III 60 1265
	15,15	III 748 762 763	18,36	III 78
		790	18,37	III 514
	15,16	III 790 1265	19,12	III 78
	15,18-21	III 321	20-21	III 88 97 105
	15,19f	III 539		1302
	15,20	III 303	20,9	III 67
	15,26	III 522 529 790	20,21	III 355 280 305
		1317		517 641 748
	15,27	III 529		922 1098 1180
	15,41	III 60		1298 1302 1333
	16,1-4	III 321 1191	20,21-23	III 227 926
	16,4	III 530	20,22	III 134 992
	16,5f	III 529	20,22-23	III 59 1130
	16,6	III 961	20,23	III 992 1081
	16,12f	III 519 522 529	20,24f	III 101 105 213
		695 763	20,28	IV 246
	16,12-15	III 748 762 763	20,30	III 214
		992	20,30-31	III 213 792 810

	21	III 208	1,21-26	III 271
	21,1	III 213	1,22	III 749
	21,1-8	III 215	2,14	III 138 270 271
	21,1-25	III 213-215	2,14-36	III 182
	21,9-14	III 215	2,32	III 792
	21,15	III 246 247 479	2,37	III 270
		640	2,37-42	III 138 139
	21,15-17	III 211 213 215	2,39	III 67
		216 217-224	2,41	III 1031
		241 260 269	3,1	III 271
		311 479-485	3,1-16	III 526
		604 612 925	3,12	III 182 271
		1130 1133 1266	3,15	III 792
	21,15-28	III 208	3,21	IV 27
	21,16	III 219 263	3,26	III 182
	21,16-17	III 481	4,5-31	III 951
	21,17	III 247 266	4,8	III 271
	21,18	III 215	4,8-12	III 182
	21,19	III 348	4,8-14	III 526
	21,20	III 213	4,11	III 264
	21,22-23	III 213 214	4,12	III 294 305 506
	21,24f	III 213 214		923 1098
	21,25	III 214 792	4,18-20	III 792
Acts	1-12	III 138	4,19	IV 27
	1,1-8	III 992	4,33	III 792
	1,3	III 104	5,1	III 271
	1,3-8	III 255	5,1-11	III 139
	1,6	III 54	5,11	III 147
	1,7	III 539	5,12	III 271
	1,8	III 50 67 139	5,12-16	III 526
		255 348 522	5,12-42	III 138
		749 762 790	5,17	III 101 270
		792 958 1174	5,17-42	III 951
		1264 1317	5,29	III 270 271
	1,13	III 102 270	5,29-32	III 182
	1,15-17	III 271	5,32	III 526 749 792
	1,16	IV 27	6,1-6	III 139
	1,16-26	III 139	6,2ff	III 351
	1,17	III 114	6,8ff	III 40
	1,21-22	III 114	7,38	III 150

Acts	8,1-3	III 147	13,2	III 116
	8,1-4	III 68	13,31	III 792
	8,2-25	III 139	13,42-48	III 67
	8,14	III 249	13,46	III 72
	8,14-17	III 926	13,46-48	III 67 282
	8,20	III 271	14,22f	III 350
	9,3-6	III 108	14,23	III 139 309 352
	9,4	III 990	15,1	III 271 281
	9,15	III 107	15,131	III 138 139
	9,15-16	III 108	15,1-16,5	III 138 139
	9,20	III 792	15,5	III 271 281
	9,31	III 139 147	15,6	III 160
	9,34	III 271	15,6f	III 955
	9,40	III 271	15,6-12	III 271
	10	III 1194	15,6-35	III 574
	10-11	III 271	15,7	III 271 282
	10,1-8	III 66	15,10	III 281
	10,1-11,18	III 66-68	15,13-21	III 363
	10,1-43	III 139	15,14	III 282
	10,9-23	III 66	15,22-29	III 954
	10,10	III 240	15,28	III 275 281 526
	10,24-33	III 66	15,41	III 150
	10,34-48	III 66	16,4	III 954
	10,35	III 67	16,13	III 284
	10,37-43	III 749	17,28	IV 81
	10,39-42	III 790 792	18,9f	III 300 520 528
	10,40	III 571	19,8-12	III 526
	10,40-42	III 308	20,5-15	III 302
	10,47	III 67	20,17	III 376f
	11,1-18	III 66	20,25	III 537
	11,2	III 249	20,28	III 150 220 309
	11,18	III 67		352 373 376
	11,19	III 40		377 992 1333
	11,19-20	III 68		1334
	11,20-26	III 139	21,15-26	III 363
	11,26	III 142 1163	22,17-21	III 67
	12,1-5	III 147	26,14-20	III 108
	12,1-24	III 951	26,16	III 749
	12,17	III 363	28,25	IV 27
	13,28	III 138	Rom 1,1-15	III 138

	2,13	III 1254		2,10-16	III 523
	3,2	III 84		2,15	III 536
	5,10	III 234		3,5	III 922
	5,12	III 1098;		3,5-9	III 926
		IV 245		3,9	III 926 991
	5,15-18	III 1098		3,11	III 205-264
	6,9	III 320		3,11-17	III 1066
	8,5-6	III 994		3,16-17	III 991
	8,9	III 993		4,1	Praef.; III 922
	8,9-17	III 994			926 1301 1303
	8,15-18	III 747		4,15	III 817
	8,28-30	III 995 997		4,19-5,13	III 954
	8,29	III 994		5,1-5	III 1081
	9,4	III 84		5,1-13	III 138
	9,6-8	III 113		5,3-13	III 160
	9,27	III 72		5,5	III 1053 1064
	10,8-15	III 138		5,11-13	III 1053 1064
	10,9-15	III 924		6,15	III 991
	11,13	III 69		6,19	III 991
	11,22	III 319		7,10	III 772
	11,25	III 72		7,12	III 772
	12,4	III 974		7,17	III 793
	12,4-5	III 997		7,19	III 1254
	12,5	III 974 987		7,40	III 762
	12,6	IV 264		8,4-13	III 284
	13,1	III 122		9,7-10	IV 221
	13,8-10	III 1100		9,14	III 961
	14,17	III 82 1143		9,16	III 792
	15,4	IV 114 272		9,19-22	III 107
	15,13	III 1317		10,4	III 206 264
	15,15	III 926		10,15	IV 120
	15,16	III 1317		10,17	III 1196
	15,16-19	III 108 138		10,32	III 566
	15,18	III 526		11,2	III 138
	15,18-19	III 1301		11,5	III 108
	15,20	III 255 277		11,17-34	III 138
	16,25f	IV 219		11,22	III 566
1 Cor	1,1	III 566		11,23-27	III 922
	1,17	III 351		11,24	III 134 306
	1,23-25	III 107		11,25	III 87

1 Cor	11,26	III 306 382		2,6-10	III 160
	12,3-11	III 993		3,3	III 534
	12,4-11	III 987 988		3,5-6	III 1301
	12,4-30	III 987 997		3,6	Praef.
	12,6	III 83 1143		4,6	III 762
	12,11	III 83 108 160		5,1-10	III 539
		1143		5,14	III 311
	12,12	III 108 987		5,17-21	III 138
		990 1005 1040		5,18	III 922
		1129 1158		5,18-20	III 308
	12,12-13	III 992 1031		5,20	III 922 926
	12,13	III 1097 1195			1301 1333
	12,14-26	III 987		11,3f	III 528
	12,20-27	III 1134		11,5-16	III 528
	12,27	III 987 1043		11,6	III 762
	12,28	III 117 202		11,17	IV 120
	13,1-8	III 1100		12,11	III 230 526
	13,1-13	III 1254		12,12	III 138 526 528
	14	III 341		13,1-4,10	III 138 954
	14,4-11	III 1317		13,3	III 526 1301
	14,26-35	III 339		13,13	III 1317
	15,1	III 770 776	Gal	1-2	III 40
	15,1f	III 814		1,1	III 107 109 139
	15,1-11	III 769			528
	15,1-14	III 793ff		1,1-9	III 750
	15,2	III 770		1,6-9	III 109 255
	15,3	III 770 776		1,6-12	III 528
	15,5	III 101 182		1,8	III 281 793 797
	15,9	III 114		1,11	III 107
	15,11	III 58 359 366		1,11-18	III 255
		770 776 814		1,11-24	III 109
	15,11-14	III 108 795		1,12	III 130 528
	15,12	III 1066		1,13	III 566
	15,19	III 566		1,14	III 809
	15,51	IV 120		1,15	III 107
	15,51-52	III 539		1,15-16	III 109
	15,52	III 315		1,16	III 528 762
	15,58	III 359		1,18	III 139 228 272
2 Cor	1,1	III 566			273 811
	1,18	III 793		2,2	III 115 139

Eph	2,6-10	III 528	3,2	III 569
	2,7	III 109 274	3,3-5	III 762
	2,7-9	III 69 139 282	3,5	III 307; IV 219
	2,7-10	III 108 109	3,10	III 566
	2,10	III 250	3,15	III 995
	2,11	III 88 283	4,1-3	III 988
	2,11-21	III 275	4,1-8	III 988
	2,14	III 283f	4,1-16	III 1161
	3,5	III 109 528	4,4	III 1043
	3,16	III 48	4,4-8	III 988
	3,23-24	III 747	4,5	III 1161
	3,13-4,7	III 747	4,7	III 985
	3,25-28	III 747	4,11	III 117 202 248
	3,26-28	III 990		365 750 1161
	3,27	III 1041		1203
	3,27-28	III 1031	4,11-16	III 1043 1161
	3,29	III 747	4,12	III 1345
	4,1-3	III 747	4,14	III 1333
	4,4-6	III 747	4,15	III 990 1129
	4,4-7	III 747 923		1345
	4,14	III 362	4,15-16	III 989 997
	4,19	III 1010		1043
	4,26	III 928	4,16	III 986 1000
	5,16-25	III 993 1099		1002
	5,17	III 941	4,24	III 1002
	1,3-6	III 995	5,22-32	III 926
	1,9-10	III 750	5,23	III 1084
	1,22	III 982 989 994	5,23-29	III 1099
	1,22-23	III 989 997	5,25-27	III 1086
		1043	5,25-30	III 1043
	1,23	III 989 997	5,31	III IV 246
	2,12-16	III 750	6,1	III 368
	2,19	III 997 1000	6,12-16	III 303
		198	6,20	III 1333
	2,19-21	III 750	Phil 1,2	III 108 376
	2,19-22	III 750	1,1-2	III 377 379
	2,20	III 201 205 255	1,2	III 376
		307 1203	1,23	III 539
	2,21	III 260	2,7	III 1002
	2,20-22	III 264	4,9	III 366

Col	1,18	III 149 974 985	2,7	III 108 351 792
		1002	3,1-10	III 351
	1,18-20	III 989 997	3,5	III 566
	1,24	III 990	3,7	III 327
	1,24-28	III 997	3,14	III 350
	2,6	III 793	3,15	III 190 350
	2,11-12	III 1031		564-568 995
	2,19	III 985 989	3,16	III 362
		1043	4,6	Praef.; III 351
	4,10	III 431	4,10	III 311
1 Thess	1,1	III 108 566	4,11	III 351
	1,5	III 528	4,11-14	III 309 351
	2,4	III 528	4,13	III 351
	2,7	III 528	4,14	III 352
	2,13	III 255 528	4,16	III 351
	2,14	III 566	5,1-22	III 351
	4,1-8	III 925	5,9-12	III 954
	4,13-18	III 78	5,19f	III 954
	4,15-17	III 538f	5,21f	III 350
	5,1-3	III 78	6,3	III 351
	5,1-6	III 539	6,11	III 351
	5,20f	IV 120	6,13	III 351
2 Thess	1,1	III 108 566	6,14	III 350 375
	1,4	III 566	6,20	Praef.; III 351
	1,7-2,5	III 78		359 366 716
	2,1-6	III 539		750 963
	2,5	III 792 797	2 Tim	1,6-9
	2,15	III 769 793 797		III 309 352 926
	2,16	III 260	1,7	III 1317
	3,4	III 954	1,11	III 792
	3,6	III 769 954	1,12	III 366
	3,14	III 954	1,13	III 793
1 Tim	1,3	III 537	1,13-14	III 352 750
	2,1-9	III 351	1,14	III 309 963
	2,2	III 959	2,1	III 350f
	2,3-6	III 305	2,2	III 350f 375
	2,4	III 311 1118		750 793
		1257	2,20	III 1066
	2,4-6	III 1098	3,1-9	III 351
	2,5	III 159 930 981	3,14	III 750
			3,14-17	III 351

	3,16	IV 29ff		12,18-24	III 1144
	3,16f	III 810; IV 270		13,17	III 377
	4,1-5	III 351		13,20	III 264
	4,5-8	III 350 375	Jas	2,17	IV 45
	4,9-21	III 688		2,25	III 362
	4,11	III 351		4,12	III 964
	4,20	III 537		5,14-15	III 926
Tit	1,5	III 309 350 375 377 379	1 Pet	1,11	IV 27
	1,5-7	III 376 377 382		1,12	IV 219
	1,5-14	III 351		1,18	III 809
	1,7	III 309 365		2,4-8	III 264
	1,12	IV 81		2,5	III 159 1143
	1,13	III 365		2,9	III 1069 1198
	2,1	III 351		2,21	III 1191
	2,2-10	III 351		4,5-7	III 539
	2,7-8	III 351		4,8	III 1100
	2,10	III 351		5,1-2	III 377
	2,14-15	III 351		5,1-4	III 220
	2,15	III 365		5,1-6	III 1143
	3,1f	III 351		5,4	III 264
	3,9-11	III 351		5,11	III 1345
	3,10	III 1047		5,13	III 431
Philem	1	III 108	2 Pet	1,19	IV 271
Heb	1,1	III 108 756		1,20	IV 120 236
	3,1-6	III 995 997 1000		1,20f	IV 32
	3,6	III 1085		1,21	IV 95
	3,17	III 377		3,3-13	III 539
	4,12	IV 273		3,8-16	III 78
	6,4-6	III 841		3,15	III 108
	7.23-25	III 84		3,15f	III 528
	9,13-15	III 992	1 John	2,1	III 266 301
	9,15-17	III 152		2,18	III 539
	10,9-14	III 152		2,20f	III 535
	10,12-14	III 931		2,26	III 535
	10,14	III 932		2,27	III 535
	10,16	III 534		3,1-8	III 923
	10,23	III 762		3,16	III 1191
	11,6	III 1094		4,7	III 1079 1100
				4,9-10	III 923
				4,16	III 1079 1100

1 John	5,13	III 793
2 John	10f	III 1053
	12	III 792
3 John	13	III 792
Rev	1-3	III 361 370
	1,3	III 355ff
	1,6	III 1345
	1,12	III 361
	1,16	III 361
	1,17f	III 192
	1,20	III 213 361
	2,1	IV 123
	2,18-29	III 361
	3,7	III 192 260 264
	4,8	III 1182
	7,4-9	III 113
	13,3-8	III 325
	14,8	III 431
	16,19	III 431
	17,5	III 431
	17,9	431
	19,11	III 212
	19,16	III 264
	20	III 315
	20,1-6	III 326
	20,1-10	III 314 317
	21,14	III 307
	22,18	III 811
	22,20	III 539

INDEX OF NAMES

N.B. The Roman numerals designate the *treatise* and the Arabic the *marginal* numbers.

- A**bel III 1039 771
 Abelard, P III 721 865
 Abraham III 48 197
 Acaciani III 427
 Acacius III 622
 Achelis III 315
 Adam III 1040
 Adam, K. III 135 158 192 193 981
 1039
 Adamantius III 1192A
 Adventists III 317
 Aërius III 337
 Aeschilus III 191
 Agapitus, Pope III 627
 Agathon III 582 628 632 827 833
 Agathus (St.) III 833
 Agnosticism III 881
 Agrippinus III 419
 Aguilar III 1010
 Ahmed III 291
 Aigrain, R. III 24
 A Lapide, C. III 72
 Albertus Magnus (St.) III 74 823
 Albigensians III 1022 1094
 Alcantara (de) P. (St.) III 1234
 Alcañiz III 315
 Alexander III III 582 1230
 Alexander VII III 719 720
 Alexander of Hales III 855
 Alfaro I III 761
 Algermissen, C. III 24 27 292 317 429
 784 1224 12134 1240 1243 1257
 1284 1293
 Aliberch, S. IV 4
 Allo, E.B. III 213 317 325 361
 Almarichus de Bena III 291
 Alonso, J.M. III 979
 Alonso Bárcena, Ph. III 416 501 584
 635 674 684 698 738 766 767 813
 845 899
 Aloysius Gonzaga (St.) III 725 1234
 Altaner, B. III 429f 1345
 Amann, E. III 650 652 654
 Amat III 1338
 Ambrosiaster III 230 315 372
 Ambrose (St.) III 216 230 265 315 415
 427 500 572 650 823 840 844 964
 992 1046 1060 1063 1175 1182;
 IV 19 39 277
 Amiot, F. III 1007
 Anabaptists III 292 317
 Anacletus III 1227
 Anastasius I III 611 650
 Ancher, J.B. III 178 237
 Anger, J. III 151 972 1010 1284 1287
 1293 1313
 Anglicans III 390 426 494 943 1093
 1156 1169 1179 1215 1044 1251
 1257
 Anicetus III 351
 Anomoei III 113; IV 107
 Anonymous (ca. 260) III 265 367
 Anselm (St.) III 823 853 1234
 Antoninus (St.) 1234; IV 66
 Antoninus Abb. (St.) III 1238
 Antoninus of Padua (St.) III 823 1234
 Aphraates III 174 178 236
 Apollinaris III 624
 Apollinaris of Laodicea III 315
 Aprutino III 1331
 Archadius, Bishop III 582
 Archelaus, S. IV 19 107
 Arians III 421ff 621 941
 Arias Montano IV 160
 Arintero, J.G. III 1010
 Aristides III 821 1192
 Aristophanes III 191
 Aristotle III 507

Arius III 225 624
 Arnaldich, L. IV 140
 Arnobius III 624 821
 Arquilliere, H.X. III 18 471 596
 Arrigoni III 1331
 Asensio, F. IV 187
 Assernani III 1032
 Athanasius (St.) III 415 421 650 753
 796 823 840
 Athenagoras III 821; IV 34 64
 Aubert, R. III 8 1125
 Augustine (St.) III 8 16 204 218 232
 266 290 291 315 326 361 367 413
 415 427 435f 500 535 571 589 618
 681 719 760 783 794 795 796 799
 802 814 818 819 823 840 842 844
 848 852 854 859 927 987 989 990
 1033 1039 1060 1099 1103 1110
 1138115011621167117511961209
 1225 1277; IV 19 39 42 55 90 107
 116 125 133 166 174 191 209 215
 219 231 252 265 268 274
 Aulen, G. III 391 1007
Autocephalae III 1245
Autonomae III 1245
 Ayuso Marazudela, T. IV 158

Bachiarius III 618
 Bacht, H. III 416 457 767 784; IV 98
 Bacic, A. III 18
 Bacon, F. III 860
 Bacon, R. III 859
 Bainvel, J.V. III 23 117 151 501 638
 684 689f 737 738 754 767 813 836
 841 845 871 884 908 936 1010
 1016 1026 1087 1090 1148 1209
 1216 1257; IV 3 44 136 169 220
 223
 Baisi, C. III 23 33
 Baldensperger III 23 33
 Balic, C. III 754 769 805
 Ballerini III 441 459 591 596 912
 Balmes, J. III 8 447 1276

Bannwart, Cl. III 907
 Báñez, D. III 18 441 855 893 913 1054;
 IV 135 138
 Barcos III 95 166 258
 Bardenhewer, O. III 178 452 813 1065
 Bardy, G. III 24 314f; IV 42
Barnabas letter III 315
 Barnes III 429
 Barré, H. III 1010
 Barth, K. III 43 127 154 342 391 510
 598 691 784 1023
 Basilides III 420 427
 Basil (St.) III 239 315 415 786 796 799
 823 835 844 992 1238; IV 118 122
 Basilius Ip. III 582 633
 Battifol, P. III 90 123 142 150 175 179
 186 368 371 372 381 413 433 594
 928
 Baucher, J. III 1343
 Baumann, R. III 169 186 426
 Baumgartner, Ch. III 805
 Baur, F.Ch. III 95 259 430
 Bayle, C. IV 280
 Bea, A. III 754 841 1010; IV 3 11 19
 29 44f 55f 75 79 89 92 96 100 107
 110 123 125 136 138f 169 171 176
 188
 Beauduin, L. III 24 391
 Beda (St.) III 70 74 372 820 823 848
 Bellamy, J. III 583 645
 Bellarmine, R. (St.) III 8 19 161 208
 250 277 374 383 428 439 441 501
 540 591 657 767 823 908 990
 1016 1026 1035 1036 1045 1052
 1068 1087 1115 1150 1167 1168
 1209 1235; IV 2 4 107f 113 148
 160 167 171
 Bellet, P. IV 2219
 Belser III 373
 Bender, L. III 939
 Benedict (St.) 1238 1240
 Benedict XIII III 725 823
 Benedict XIV III 402 427 442 445 726

- 823 1230 1262; IV 286
 Benedict XV III 352 402 823 864 876
 877 880 881 882 946 1223 1230;
 IV 1 22 87f 112 131 172 176f 187
 213 255 280 287 292
 Beni, A. III 24
 Benoit, P. III 382
 Benson, H. III 1244
 Benz III 291
 Beraza, B. III 884 899 917; IV 76
 Bernardinus, R. III 725
 Bernardus (St.) III 823 844 1234
 Berthier III 871
 Bertrans III 151
 Bessmer, J. III 28
 Besson III 244
 Beumer, J. III 645 993 1007 1010 1040
 1061
 Bevenot, M. III 1127
 Beyer III 371
 Bierberg, R. IV 218
 Bihlmeyer III 851
 Billerbeck, P. III 135 136 145 169 177
 186 191 361 1062
 Billot, L. III 22 151 161 189 277 330
 383 441 491 591 638 773 674 884
 899 908 936 1026 1036 1045 1052
 1053 1068 1148 1167 1168 1209
 1220 1284 1293 1316 1336; IV 3
 92 110
 Billuart, F.C.R. III 18 1052 1168; IV
 138
 Bilz, J. III 1
 Birgitta (St.) III 1234
 Bleinstein, H. III 1007
 Bliguet, M.J. III 9
 Boehmer III 123
 Boisnard, E. III 213
 Bollandus III 874
 Bonaventure (St.) III 18 374 383 729
 823 881 1234; IV 229
 Bonfrère, Iac. IV 78f 205 270
 Bonhoeffer III 151
 Boniface I (St.) III 402 427 611
 Boniface II (St.) III 581
 Boniface VIII III 823 945 982 1094
 1129 1132
 Boniface, Pb. III 582
 Bonnard, P. III 382
 Bonnefoy, J. III 1010
 Bonnetty, A. III 861
 Bononiensis III 1331
 Bonsirven, J. III 1007
 Bonwetsch III 315
 Borromeo, C. (St.) III 1234
 Bosco, J. (St.) III 1235 1240
 Bossuet, J.J. III 471 472 597
 Bouché, J. III 90 277 1293
 Boudou, A. IV 191
 Bouffard, A. III 1224
 Bouyer, L. III 1007
 Bover, J.M. III 13 136 371 373 928 972
 1007 1010; IV 164 218
 Boyer, Ch. III 754
 Bozius III 1150
 Braun, F.M. III 27 41 94 150 154 169
 185 342 382 566 1010; IV 218
 Brinkmann, B. III 645
 Brinktrine, J. III 24 1007
 Brown, R.E. I IV 218
 Bruders, H. III 24 186 371 372
 Brunec, M. III 54
 Brunner, E. III 28 127 691
 Brunsmann, J. III 24 313
 Buddha, *Buddhism* III 1224
 Buechsel III 135
 Bulst, W. III 382
 Bultmann, R. III 41 168 181 182
 Buzy III 135
 Buzy, D. IV 218
Byzantism III 942
 Cabrera, Fr, Alonso de IV 268
 Cabrol, F. III 760
Caesaro-papism III 942
 Cafasso, J. (St.) III 725

Cajetan, Thomas de Vio III 18 441 750
 855; IV 66 72
 Caius III 314
 Calasanz, J. (St.) III 1234
 Calcagno, F.X. III 23 684 698 899 908
 1026 1053 1293
Calvinists III 919 979 1023 1072 1128
 1157 1169 1244 1251; IV 45
 Camilus de Lellis (St.) III 1234
 Campenhausen, H. III 28 88
 Candal, E. III 383
 Canisius, P. III 823 1235
 Cano, M. III 19 441 501 591 594 688
 728 761 767 839 884 889 908 913
 1016 1041 1052 1168; IV 138
Canonists III 470 473 496 1292f 1322-
 1327
 Cantera, F. IV 164
 Capéran III 1052 1087
 Capreolus III 855
 Capua, F. III 650
 Carbone, C. III 28
 Carlostadius IV 67
 Carolus I III 1257
 Carolus VII III 472
 Carreyre, J. III 718
 Cartechini, S. III 884 899
Cartesians III 860
 Carthusianus III 74
 Caruel III 486
 Casalensis III 1339
 Casel, O. III 981
 Caspar III 357 394 413 430 433
 Cassiliensis III 1340
Catalogi Liberiani III 367 436
Cathari III 1022 1073
 Catharina (St.) III 12134
 Catharinus, A. III 1128
 Cavalla III 371
 Cavallera, F. III 880
 Cavatassi, N. III 208
 Celestine I (St.) III 352 402 416 427
 582 760

Cercia III 491 638
 Cerfaux, L. III 24 35 154 382 458 972
 987 1007
 Cerinthus III 314
 Cerularius, Mich. III 1249
 Ceulemans, F.C. III 53 67 75 105 270
 2372 747
 Chapman, J. III 652
 Charlier, L. III 735 805
Charismatics III 127 340f
 Chasles III 316
 Chavasse, A. III 1007
 Chemnitius, M IV 45
 Chenus, D. III 805
 Childebertus I III 627
 Choupin, L. III 645 658 663 674 676f
 683 809
 Chrismann, Ph. IV 108
 Ciasca III 178
 Cipriani, S. III 24
 Claereboets III 371
 Clement V III 582
 Clement VI III 170 260 402 427 473
 478 614; IV 172
 Clement VIII IV 286
 Clement IX III 823
 Clement XI III 720
 Clement of Alexandria III 334 417 431
 818 821 1162; IV 37 42 64 70f 266
 Clercq III 582
 Cletus III 360
 Closen, G.E. IV 283
 Coathalem, H. III 24 1010
 Colet III 1339
 Collomb, M. IV 2
 Colomer, L. III 24 1010
 Colson, J. III 330 370
 Colunga, A. IV 1 164 205
 Commodianus III 315
Communists III 944
COUNCILS:
 —*Of the Apostles* III 363 935
 —*Orange II* III 5821 1064

- Basileense* III 471 581 596
 —*Chalcedon* III 416 427 456 457 550
 563 582 625 631 652 696 827 828
 1249
 —*Carthage* III 581
 —*Constance* III 471 489 582 588 596
 597 721 861 885
 —*Constantinople I* III 413 427 455
 582 589 696
 —*Constantinople II* III 550 563 582
 652 653 721 1273
 —*Constantinople III* III 489 550 563
 582 628 632 654 827 828 833 1249
 —*Constantinople IV* III 427 563 582
 599 622 629 632 945 1249
 —*Ephesus* III 416 427 550 482 624
 630 827 832 1249
 —*Florence* III 170 172 260f 383 395f
 416 427 473 477 550 582 599 635
 913 1028 1040 1056 1058 1094
 1097 21103
 —*Jerusalem* III 574
 —*Lateran* III 628 833
 —*Lateran I* III 563 582
 —*Lateran II* III 582 1056
 —*Lateran III* III 582
 —*Lateran IV* III 416 427 582 634 848
 861 928 1094
 —*Lateran V* III 416 427 717
 —*Lyons I* III 582
 —*Lyons II* III 395 416 427 473 477 582
 599 634 928 1249
 —*Milevitanum II* III 581
 —*Nicaea I* III 421 427 454 550 563
 582 589 621 696 848
 —*Nicaea II* III 550 563 582 827
 —*Pisa* III 471 581 596
 —*Rimini* III 422
 —*Roman* III 624 833
 —*Sardis* III 421 581
 —*Trent* III 44 130 294 345f 352 373
 374 550 563 565 582 635 704 723
 743 745 757 785 787 788 799 805
 827 828 848 861 862 864 865 896
 906 907 908f 911f 945 982 1028
 1030 1078 911f 945 982 1028
 1030 1078 10811094 1096 1097
 1196 1248 1294 1333 1334 1343k
 IV passim
 —*Vatican I* III 7 9 17 97 122 128 130
 164 171 172 209-211 260 290 294
 295f 297 312 334 344 346 352 373
 374 387 395f 397ff 416 427 428
 434 441 443f 460f 466 474-477
 512f 515 549 550 551 553 565 580
 582 593 594 595 597-601 603 640
 642 645 647 649 657 669 673 687
 669 673 687 689 693 696 710-713
 717 725 744 745 757 758 780 787
 788 805 806 827 828 861 862 874
 875 881 885 887 890f 894 895 896
 897 899 902 906-913 916 920 921
 946 1001 1005 1028 1076 1077
 1093 1094 1098 1131 1132 1136
 1138 1150 1152 1220 1224 1276
 1294 1328-1343; IV passim
 —*Vienne* III 582 861
Conciliarists III 470f 473 596
Confucians III 1224
Congar, M.J. III 24 28 67 158 186 881
 993 997 1039 1020 1246 1277
 1293
Congregationalists III 127 342 691
 1251
Conrad a Gelnhausen III 956
Constantine I III 582 1167
Constantine IV III 582 941
Constantine Pog. III 628
Constantine Emp. III 422
Conte a Coronata III 1223
Copernicus III 683
Coppens, J. IV 218
Corbishly, Th. III 24
Cornelius III 66f
Cornely, R. III 108 178 274 747 987;
 IV 2 19 57 125 140 148 163 166

Cotter, A.C. III 1 23 33 35 88 117 161
 285 383 738 767 800 803 804 813
 842 845 867 871 899 1278

Cottolengo, I. III 1240

Courtade, G. IV 21 218

Craig, C.T. III 247 391 1007

Crammner III 1257

Cremer, H. IV 29

Crets, G.J. IV 140

Criado, R. IV 46 67 149 160

Crisóstomo de Pamplona IV 89

Crivelli, C. III 1244

Crosta III 151

Cuadrado, G. IV 218

Cullmann, O. III 27 28 161 168 169

185 198 271 291 329 342 382 391

429 458 784

Cuq, E. III 1343

Cureton, W. III 175

Cyprian (St.) III 16 227 232 327 394

413 419f 427 435f 486 500 594

617 620 844 1060 1063 1102 1150

1162 1175 1181 1273 1345; IV 64

71

Cyril of Alexandria (St.) III 243 619

823 840

Cyril of Jerusalem (St.) III 236 823

1175 1192; IV 38 55

D'Ailly, P. III 471 596

Dain Cohel IV 218

D'Ales, A. III 650 871 1257

Damasus (St.) III 415 422ff 426f 582

610 621 624

Damen, C. III 910

Daniel III 52 244

Danielou, J. III 382 736

Daremborg III 191 1343

Dausch, P. IV 138

David, P. III 192 737

De Aldama, J.A. III 899 1090

De Ambroggi, P. IV 29 218

De Ausejo, S. IV 219

De Becdelievre, A. III 720

De Britto, J. (St.) III 725

De Broglie III 151

De Capua, V. III 178

De Fraine, J. IV 78

De Ghellinck, J. III 648 854

De Granada, L. IV 268

De Grandmaison, L. III 70 75f 175 754
 1258

De Groot, J.V. III 22 151 161 250 277

313 372 383 441 501 591 638 658

674 677 684 697f 730 738 767 813

836 841 842 845 867 871 880 884

899 908 914 926 957 1052 1148

1168 1209 1279 1292 1344

De Guibert, J. III 1 9 23 151 313 459

471f 486 499 510 591 596 638 684

689 698 738 754 784 813 845 884

1016 21026 1042 1045 1052 1068

1087 1090 1119 1148 1150 1168

1193 1209 1215 1236 1284 1293

De Hassia Henr. III 596

D'Herbigny, M. III 1 21 27 35 37 40

88 117 1q42 151 161 175 198 207f

250 259 271f 285 292 313 330 344

367 368 371 372 383 390 391 413

416 423 441 458f 491 499 501 540

591 597 608 638 650 656 681 683

684 871 884 914 936 943 951 972

1007 1015 1016 1025 1026 1045

1052 1053 1054 1068 1074 1087

1090 1093 1113 1116 1119 1128

1156 1193 1200 1209 1215 1216

1224 1225 1232 1239 1243 1245

1251 1257 1259 1262 1267 1276

1280 1293

De Hulst, M. IV 109

Deimel, L. III 972 981

Deismann III 150

Dejaifve, G. III 382

De la Brière. Y. III 24 35 1148 1209

De la Taille, M. III 151

De León, L. IV 160 268

- De l'Espinois, H. III 683
 Delmée, A. III 1127
 Dell III 168 182
 Del Páramo, S. IV 217ff
 De Lubac, H. III 24 150 761 928 972
 1010
 De Nassau, I. III 191
 Deneffe III 767 806 909 913
 Denis, L. III 23
 Dennefeld III 222
 Denzinger, H. III 907
 De Poulpique, A. III 24 1209
 De San III 22 151 285 313 529 638 697
 730 707 767 1008 1016 1042 1045
 1052 1053 1148 168 1209 1279
 1292; IV 3f 121
 Descartes III 860
 Deschamps, V.A. III 8f 911
 De Solages, Br. III 736
 D'Espierres, A. III 1234
 De Spinola, A. III 191
 Despont, J. III 1224
 De Tuya, M. IV 125 217f
 Deubner III 1169
 De Vine, F. IV 221
 De Vooght, P. III 737
 De Vregille III 683
 De Vries, W. III 760
 Dhanis, E. III 754
Diatessaron of Tatian III 174 178
 Diaz, J. IV 1
 Di Bartolo, S. IV 109
 Di Capua, F. III 650
Didache III 340 751 1162
 Didymus of Alexandria (St.) III 240
 821; IV 64
 Dieckmann, H. III 1 9 21 27 33 35 37
 540 74 84 88 90 93 110 112 117
 123 142 150f 154 161 175 179 181
 208 244 277 285 291 313 321 330
 252 3721 383 411 418 429 432f
 435 438 501 520 527 538 540 573
 578 581 591 600 638 650 658 674
 676 695 698 702 720 726 730 737
 738 754 761 813 845 871 880 884
 899 908 914 972 1016 1045 1052
 1053 1054 1063 1090 1209 1276
 1284 1293
 Diekamp, F. III 676 899
 Dikae III 191
 Dillenschneider, C. III 1010
 Dillersberger, J. III 1010
 Dionysius of Corinth (St.) III 47 431
 Döllinger, Jo. Ig. III 259 291 390 474
 597
 Dominicus (St.) III 1234 1238
Donatists III 290 783 1073 1074 1186
 Donatus Ep. III 582
 Donoso Cortés IV 269
 Dorado, G.G. III 221
 Dorsch, Ae. III 22 88 117 151 161 250
 277 313 330 372 471 501 540 573
 591 638 641 650 657 684 689 698
 738 762 767 813 845 859 871 899
 908 914 936 972 1007 1016 1026
 1042 1045 1052 1068 1087 1090
 1113 1116 1119 1143 1145 1148
 1193 1209 215 1217 1267 1280
 1284 1292; IV 3 44 92 113 140
 Driedo III 1168
 Ducblanchy, E. III 24 313 447 596 638
 640 645 657 754 1087
 Dubreil III 912
 Duggan, J. IV 109
 Du Manoir, H. III 928 1010
 Dumont, C. III 1127 1245
 Duncker, P.G. IV 67 286
 Dupin III 471
 Durand, A. IV 3 50 75 89 148 159 166
 169 191 232 247
 Durandus de Osca IV 20

E*cclectics* III 126
 Edler III 912w
 Edward King (St.) III 1234
 Egger, F. III 151; IV 176

Eguiluz, A. III 760
 Ehrhard, A. III 179
 Ekardus III 865
 Eleutherius III 1227
 Eliachim III 192
 Elias Levita IV 61
 Elisabeth Lusit. (St.) III 1234
 Elorduy, E. III 972
 Elorriaga, A.M. III 899
 Enciso, I. IV 218 286
 Engberding, H. III 1010
 Ephraem (St.) III 174 178 237 823
 Epiphanius (St.) III 238 360 373 435f
 437 622 753 762 796 840; IV 98
 107 174
 Epivent III 1338
 Erasmus, D. IV 108 171
Eschatologists III 41 52 93f 142 146
 154 317 343 and passim
 Esteve, E.M. IV 90
 Estius III 373
 Eubel III 434 1252
 Eugene IV III 416 582 1094
 Eunomius, *Eunomians* III 624
 Euringer, S. III 179
 Euripides III 191
 Eusebius of Caesarea III 235 291 314f
 357 367 427 435f 452 802 1073
 1306; IV 36 64 71
Eutichianism III 625 941
 Eutychius III 625 626 652
 Eva III 1040
Evolutionists III 93 125 293 338-341
 358ff 980 1179
 Eybel III 472
Fabbi, F. IV 191
 Fabro, C. III 28
 Favre, R. III 899 911
Febronians III 390 597
 Febronius III 166 237 440 472
 Feckes, C. III 972 981 1007 1010
 Fedele, P. III 1343

Federer, K. III 760
 Feeney, L. III 1093 1094
 Feine, H.E. III 394
 Felder, H. III 23 33 313 372 638 859
 871 899 908 1052 1053 1284
 1292; IV 4
 Félix III III 622
 Felten III 373
 Fenton, J.C. III 669 1094
 Ferdinand I III 191
 Fernández, A. III 1010
 Fernández Truyols, A. IV 169 192 209
 216 218
 Fessler-Jungmann III 813
 Fichte III 291
Figurists IV 212
 Filippi, A. III 908
 Fillion, L.Cl. III 221; IV 2 223 264
 269f 289
 Filograssi, J. III 754 805
 Firmilianus III 419
 Fischer, A. III 1224
 Fitzgerald III 912
 Flavianus III 631
 Flavius Josephus IV 26 60 130
 Flick, M. III 754
 Florit, E. IV 3
 Fonck, L. III 166 176 179; IV 176
 Forget, J. III 582
 Fortescue, A. III 1245
 Foullechat, D. III 865
 Fox, G. III 292
 Fraghi, S. III 1016 1026 1045 1052
 1053 1068
Fragment, Muratorium IV 29 46 71
 Francis of Assisi (St.) III 1234 1238
 Franquesa, P. III 909; IV 218
 Fransen, P. III 911
 Franzelin, I.B. III 20 88 117 151 277
 285 313f 2373 383 439 442 501
 594 600 638 641 648 658 662 674
 689 692 700 711 714 738 767 787
 813 839 845 884 899 908 911 913

914 972 1016 1026 1045 1052
 1053 1087 1090 1284 1291 1293
 1294 1320 1328 1335 1339 1343
 1344; IV 3f 11 21 44 56 75 108 111
 138 140 148 156 161 164
Fratlicelli III 290 743 885 1022 1074
 1186
Frenaud, G. III 1010
Frohschammer III 511 708 717 721
 743 865
Fuchs, Jos. III 1284 1292
Fulgentius (St.) III 1033 1060 1103
Funk, F.X. III 16 176 310 315 353 493f
 569 818 844; IV 69
G
Gächter, P. III 218 382; IV 29 58
Gagnebet, M.R. III 735 805
Gaius III 431 432
Galbiati, E. IV 176
Galdos, R. IV 25
Galileo Galilei III 656 682; IV 249
Gallicans III 29 166 472-475 593 595
 596f 601 647 943 945 1338
Gallicanism III 123 166 396 472-475
 596 601 942
Gams, P.B. III 1252
Gandolfi III 912
García, F. III 24 714 761 899 910 936
García Garcés, N. III 1010; IV 280
García Villada, Z. III 414 420 425 618
 852 1238
Garcíadiego, A. III 1163
Gardeil, A. III 899
Garmendia de Oraola, A. III 1127
Garrigou-Lagrange, R. III 33 736
Garrucci, R. III 244
Garzend, L. III 909 913
Gasser, Bp. III 549 594 595 599 608
 639 687 704 711 787 890 907 910
 912 1340 1342; IV 16 79
Gastaldi III 1331
Gelasius I III 98 402 427 446 611 626
 819

Gelin III 317
Gellius III 886
Gemelli, A. III 683
Gamma Galgani (St.) III 1235
Georgius, Pb. III 582
Gerhardus, Io. IV 45
Gerson, John III 471 596
Getino III 250
Giacchi, O. III 683
Gil Ulecia, A. IV 2
Giles, E. III 25 383
Gillet, M. III 1010
Giordani, I. III 1243
Gits, A. III 718
Gladstone III 597
Glez, G. III 41 154 342
Gloege, G. III 41 154 342
Gnostics III 509 783 1150
Goebel, B. IV 4
Goemans III 641
Goetz, K.G. III 182
Goguel, M. III 41 94f 125f 167 173 342
 393
Gomá Civit, I. IV 292
Gomá Tomás, I III 34; IV 223 280
Gommenginger, A. III 1054 1063
González, T. III 591
González Moral, I. III 938
Goossens, W. III 972 1007
Gordillo, M. III 26 166 394
Gore, C. IV 109
Gorge, D. IV 292
Goupil, A.-A. IV 3f
Graber, R. III 52 180 214
Grabmann, M. III 9 20 291 471 596
 848 854 855 856 871f 997
Greeks III 599
Graffin III 187 236
Gramatica, L. III 1239
Granderath, Th. III 20 161 230 333f
 387 396 443 459 461 472f 472f
 475f 591 601 638 642 687 908 910
Grasso, D. III 406

Gratianus III 1343
 Grea III 277
 Gregory the Great (St.) III 73f 150 487
 550 572 582 627 753 820 823 990
 1063 1065 1082 1237; IV 40 120
 1212 257 266 278
 Gregory VII (St.) III 1064
 Gregory XII III 582
 Gregory XVI III 565 1330; IV 286
 Gregory Nazianzen (St.) III 239 588
 844 852; IV 118 143
 Gregory of Nyssa (St.) III 239 753 796
 844; IV 38
 Gregorovius, F. III 1282
 Greith III 912
 Grill III 173
 Grillmeier, A. III 416
 Grisar III 416
 Grivec, F. III 151 972 1156
 Grumel, V. III 1245 1272
 Guarnieri, A.F. III 1054
 Guenther III 511 701 743 861
 Guggenberger, K. III 1239
 Guffisberg III 394
 Guidi III 1342
 Guierry III 1338
 Gjuilelmus a S.A. III 865
 Guilelmus da Thoco III 874
 Guirand, J. III 970
 Gut, B. IV 2 11 57 75 106 109 128 136
 138 140 169 192

Hadrian I III 402 427 446 582
 Hadrian II III 582 623 629 633
 Haller, J. III 168 394 430
 Hamer, J. III 168 382
 Hammerstein (de) L. III 1292
 Hanahoe, E.F. III 1127
 Haneberg, D. IV 78
 Harnack, A. III 40 43 93 124 126 167
 174 178 179 340 393 404 433 821
 1023 1128 1157. See *Von Harnack*.
 Hart, J.H.A. III 182

Hartel, G. III 1060 1063 1345
 Hatch III 126 340
 Haugg, D. III 972 981
 Haussleiter III 315
 Hefele III 474 912
 Hegel III 358
 Hegemonius IV 19
 Hegesippus III 350 357f 435f 1162
 Heiler, F. III 26 41 94 151 166 169 391
 426 550 598 980 1023 1051 1127
 1156 1168 1215 1243 1245 1246
 1249 1259 1263 1266
 Heimbucher, M. III 1240
 Heiner, F. III 28
 Henry VI III 1257
 Henry, A.M. III 1010
 Herder III 1173 1224
 Hergenroether, C. III 291 622
 Heribertus III 1065
 Hermann, Io. III 809
 Hermas III 176 1162; IV 64
 Hermes, G. III 511 865
 Hertling, L. III 1224
 Hervé, J.M. III 23 151 1026 1052
 Hettinger, F. III 674; IV 4
 Heussi III 430
 Hiacyntus (St.) III 1234
 Hilary (St.) III 72 228 650 823 840
 1060 1162; IV 266
 Hilgenfeld III 430
 Himerius III 401 426
Hinduists III 1224
 Hippolytus (St.) III 315 435f; IV 36 64
 118 174
 Höpfl, H. IV 2 11 57 75 106 109 128
 136 138 140 169 192 280 283
 Hoffmann, K. III 1343
 Holden, H. IV 108
 Holl III 95
 Hollweck III 439
 Holstein, H. III 1007 1010
 Holtzmann, H.I. III 40 339
 Holzer, O. III 981

Holzmeister, U. III 551 300 335 371f
429 520

Honorius (Pope) III 489 654f 680

Honthelm, I.N. III 257

Hormisdas III 402 427 612 622 626
633

Horn, E. III 851

Horn, K. III 214

Hosius III 582

Huarte, G. III 899 908

Huby, J. III 13 177 181 792

Huerth, F. III 662

Hugo of St. Victor III 854

Hugon, E. III 1010 1115

Humanism III 859

Hurter, H. III 151 638 674 698 701 714
714 982 1167 1168; IV 4

Hus, J. III 166 290 337 390 721 861
865 885 942 1022 1072 1077 1128
1186

Hyginus III 436

Ianotta III 448

Ianus III 191

Iba Ed III 651 653

Ignatius of Antioch (St.) III 16 140
310 339 353 354 360 367f 370
373 403-409 427 431 569 616 844
1102 1162f; IV 69

Ignatius of Loyola (St.) III 1234 1238;
IV 15 293

Illuminists III 291 295f 743

Immisch, O. III 182

Indifferentism III 1093f

Indifferentists III 1125f

Innocent I (St.) III 401 425 427 611; IV
46

Innocent II III 582 614 721

Innocent III III 267 270 280 416 446
582 1094 1247; IV 20

Innocent IV III 582

Innocent X III 98 258 719f 1254

Innocent XII III 719

Innocent XIII III 823

Irenaeus (St.) III 16 176 310 315 355
357 2358 370 373 410f 418 427
431 435f 500 509 570 616 752
762 767 783 794 795 796 798 799
802 803 814 1033 1102 1150 1162
1167 1175 1181 1192 1227; IV 35
64 69ff 174

Irene Ip. III 582

Irenists III 668 708 735f 1007 1051
1093f 1126

Irving III 292

Isidore of Spain (St.) III 372 820 823
852; IV 40

Isidorus Pelusiota IV 215

Jacob III 187

Jacobatius III 277

Jacobites III 1036 1094

Jacobus III 363

Jacobus Viterbien III 18

Jacquemet, G. III 24 1278

Jacquier, E. III 95

Jaffe, Ph. III 401

Jahn, Io. IV 67 82

Jalland, T. G. III 426 453 1249

Jansen III 719 720 1254

Javierre, A.M. III 341 382

Jechonias III 135

Jeremias, J. III 177 186 191

Jerome (St.) III 75 115 133 213 314f
372 377-381 415 427 435f 500
618 650 796 818 823 840 844 987
1090 1103 1173 1275 1313 1314;
IV 19 39 65f 72 98 107 116f 133
143 145 160 163 174 191f 199 215
219 222 275f 280 287 289 292 294

Joachim Abbas III 291 861

John (St.) III 355

John XV III 1230

John XXII III 620 656 681 874 885 945

John of the Cross (St.) III 725 823 1234

John of St. Thomas III 442 855 871 879

John Chrysostom (St.) III 241 273 276
 372 753 796 799 823 840 968 987
 1033 1196 1277; IV 38 118 122
 191 274 443
 John of Constantinople III 150
 John Damascene (St.) III 820 823 848
 852
 John of Avila (Bl.) IV 231 268 292
 John of God (St.) III 1234
 John Dc. III 582
 John Naz. (St.) III 823
 John Nepomucene (St.) III 737
 Jolly, J.A. IV 2
 Jörg, P. III 258
Josephinists III 944
 Josephus Flavius, see Flavius Josephus
 Joñon, P. III 37 133
 Journet, Ch. III 1 24 151 277 344 382
 458 598 677 899 939 990 993
 1000 1007 1009 1010 1016 1045
 1052 1087 1113 1116 1118 1175
 1207 1284 1292
 Jugie, M. III 1 24 26 166 170 259 391
 448 548 598 783 942 979 1093
 1169 1186 1209 1215 1216 1218
 1243 1245 1246 1259 1262 1263
 1264 1267 1271
 Julian, Apostate IV 115
 Julius I III (St.) III 401 421 427 619
 Julius II III 582
 Julius III III 582
 Julius Africanus III 357
 JürgenMdeier, F. III 972 1010
 Jurieu, P. III 123 1093 1128 1156 1157
 1179
 Justinian I III 582 622 627 652 653
 1343
 Justin (St.) III 173 176 314f 751 1192;
 IV 34 64 69 98 118 174

Kaeppli, Th. III 997
 Kalt, Ed. III 173
 Karrer, O. III 28 161 169 382 458

Kastner, F. III 981
 Kattenbusch, F. III 151 179
 Keble III 1257
 Kempis, T. III 34
 Kenrick III 912
 Kephass III 187f 204
 Kerekhove, M. III 1290 1343
 Kerkvoorde, A. III 24
 Kidd III 394
 Kilber, H. III 126 1042 1052 1053
 Kilber, K. III 899
 Kirschbaum III 429 430
 Kittel, G. III 53 135 141 148 151 175
 177 186 191 361 371; IV 31
 Kleutgen, I. III 0 151 638 642 710 871f
 908 910f 913 001 1004 1095 1343;
 IV 4 78
 Knabenbauer, I. III 53 70f 75 103 105
 136 175 192 221 301 303 309 373
 564 608 750 952 989 995 1138
 1173; IV 135 140
 Knabenbauer-Merk III 797
 Kneller, C.A. III 179 339
 Koch, J. III 885
 Kögel, J. IV 29
 Köhler, th. III 1010
 Kösters, L. III 24 142 150 899 972
 Kohl III 191
 Koster, D. III 981
 Krebs, E. III 1278
 Krose, H.A. III 1224
 Kuemmel III 168 173 181

Labourdette, M. III 735 736 805 882
 899 909 100y7
 Lactantius III 315 821 1102 1192
 Lagrange, M.J. III 28 70 75 136 173
 176 180 214; IV 50 68 92 176
Laicism III 944
Laicists III 945
 Láinez, D. III 374 607; IV 160
 Lakner, F. III 9 872
 Lambert, G. III 135

- Lamy, B. IV 67
 Lamy, T.J. III 178 337
 Land III 1257
 Landgraf, L. III 899 972
 Lang, A. III 1 24 884 909 913
 Lang, H. III 972
 Lange, H. III 9
 Langen III 259 597
 Langton, Steph. III 13
 Larrañaga, V. IV 109
 Launoy III 472 597
 Laurentin, R. III 1010
Latitudinarians III 494 1125 1126 1156
 1157 1179
 Leal, Io. IV 218 292
 Le Bachelet, X.M. III 681; IV 148
 Lecler, J. III 939
 Leclercq, H. III 474
 Lecuyer, J. III 1010
 Ledóchowski Wlod. III 880
Legists III 548 942
 Legrand III 151
 Lemonnyer, A. IV 158
 Lennerz, H. III 714 861 899 1010
 Lenormant, F. IV 108
 Leo the Great (St.) III 34 233 260 267
 312 394 402 416 425 427 572 582
 621 625 631 823 1247
 Leo II III 582
 Leo IX III 170 402 427 470 550 613;
 IV 20
 Leo X III 416 582 823 1230 1254
 Leo XIII III 3 11f 17 33 48 97 105 128f
 136 170f 186 211 260 268 294
 303f 312 345 352 399 445f 476
 478 488 513 523 607 673 677 692
 721 823 838 872 874 875 877 879
 881 886 902 927 946 974 983 985
 992 1006 1129 1130 1132 1133
 1135 1138 1154 1158 1251 1295
 1296 1298 1301 1303 1307 1343
 1345; IV 1 22 87f 112 115 131 172
 176ff 187 191f 218 222 279 286
 289f
 Leo Isauricus III 941
 Leonardi, Ioan. (St.) III 1235
 Leopoldus III 944
 Lercher, L. III 9 23 35 88 151 161 177
 285 313 330 373 383 429 441 447
 459 491 501 528 540 573 591 609
 638 640 658 689 698 714 738 767
 803 813 836 845 871 874 908 914
 972 1026 1052 1053 1087 1090
 1119 1148 1168 1182 1209 1267
 1318 1344; IV 4 97 106 118 121
 128
 Lercher-Mitzka III 899
 Lercher-Schlagen. III 1029 1068 1113
 1118 1284 1292 1317. See *Schla-*
genhaufen.
 Lérins, V. (St.) III 689 753 757 758 767
 796 802 819 832 835 1162
 Lesêtre, H. III 317
 Lessius, L. IV 78f 139
 Leuba, J.L. III 100 151
 Levesque, E. III 597
 Lialine III 1007 1127
Liber Pontificalis III 367 436
Liberals III 945
Liberalism III 944
 Liberius (St.) III 422 427 650 680
 Liegé, A. III 993 1007
 Lietzmann III 93 125 339 404 433
 Lightfoot III 93 125 339 404 433
 Liguori, A.M. de (St.) III 823
 Lilley, A.L. III 28
 Linder, J. IV 776
 Linton, O. III 27 90 150f 185 339
 Linus III 360 436f
 Liparensis III 1331
 Lippert, P. III 24
 Lippl, J. III 1245
Liturgy, Mozarabic III 1032
 Llorca, B. III 970 1238 1273
 Loisy, A. III 41 94 154 168 181; IV 67
 109 118 138 174 176

Lombard, P. III 852 854
 López, F. IV 205
 Loosen, J. III 981
 Loserth, L. III 1022
 Lucentius, Bp. III 582
 Ludovicus Rex (St.) III 1234
 Ludwig, J. III 136
 Luetgert III 95
 Luis, A. III 1010
 Lusseau, H. IV 2f 75 92
 Luther III 166 257 291 329 390 548
 865 943 1023 1074 1128 1254; IV
 45 67
Lutherans III 914 979 1023 1128 1157
 1169 1244 1251

Macarius Magnes III 242
 Maccarrone, M. III 250 260
 Macedonius III 624
 Machale III 1339
 Madoz, J. III 25 383 401 414 819 932
 928 1005
 Malevez, L. III 1007
 Manes III 291
 Mangenot, E. III 70; IV 3 44 57 75 92
 106 148 151 161 169 231f
Manicheans III 291 1150
 Médebielle, A. III 24 90 136 175 186
 208
 Meinertz, M. III 24 34 40 88 150 161
 303 382 972; IV 45
 Meletius III 415
 Melita of Sardis (St.) IV 64
 Mendive, J. III 151 441 899 1167
 Menna III 622
 Mercati, A. III 1065
 Merk, A. III 175 178 681 792 794 800
 1010; IV 2 11 57 92 138f 148 169
 Mersch, E. III 151 972 1005 1007 1284
 1293
 Messia III 192
 Methodius (St.) III 1033; IV 64
 Metzner III 429

Meyer, E. III 40 179
 Michael Cerularius III 170 391 402 470
 Michael Palaeologus IV 20
 Michaelis, J.D. IV 74
 Michaud III 597
 Michel, A. III 767
 Michelitsch, A. III 23 151 250 277 313
 638 657 684 698 767 871 884 899
 914 1008 1026 1052 1053 1113
 1115 1209 1230 1234 1254 1255
 1284 1293; IV 4
 Michiels, G. III 330 371f 678 1019
Midrash III 135
Millenarism III 314-317 326 839 844
 Miller, A. IV 216 218
 Minucius Felix III 1192
 Mirbt, C. III 25
 Mitterer, A. III 972 981 1000 1007
Modernism III 787 881 1270
Modernists III 26 28 29 41 93f 167 293
 343 392 511 668 669 701 717 743
 744 785 826 860 861 865 919 944
 1157 1179 1293; IV *passim*
 Moesinger, G. III 178 237
 Molina, L. III 1041 1052
 Molland, E. III 382
 Moneti III 1331
 Monnier III 93
Monophysitism III 622 1073
Monotheletists III 655 941
Monotheletism III 628 833
 Montagnus III 884
 Montague, G. III 1010
Montanists III 291 314 353 427 620
 743 1072; IV 98
 Montanus III 291 314 359
 Montcheuil, Y. III 24
 Morel, V. III 1007 1093
 Morin, Io. IV 160
Mormons III 292 317
 Morrondo III 314
 Mosbech, H. III 88
 Moske III 95

Moyses III 232
 Müller, I. III 807 812 871; IV 3f 121
 128
 Müller, K. III 1023e
 Müller-Kolde III 780 784 943
 Müller, M. III 1010
 Muncunill, Io. III 22 151 161 212 313
 330 372 383 439 441 459 486 501
 529 584 591 638 650f 655 658 674
 684 698 738 766 767 807 813 836
 842 845 884 908 914 936 957 971
 972 1016 1026 1045 1052 1053
 1083 1087 1143 1145 1193 1209
 1215 1267; IV 3f
 Mundle III 95
 Muñoz Iglesias, S. IV 1 149 160 217f
 Mura, E. III 972 1010 1284 1293 1307
 Murillo, L. III 151; IV 176
 Murphy, F.X. III 382
 Murray III 189 1167 1168
 Musger, I. III 1010
 Musulmani III 291
Mysticism III 981

Nácar, E. IV 1 164 205
 Nadal, Hier. IV 280 293
Nationalists III 941
Naturalism III 92 691 700 708 729 785
 919 980 1293
 Nau, P. III 645 648
 Navarro Neum.M.M. III 682
 Nepomucene, J. III 737
Nestorians III 840
Nestorianism III 625 941
 Nestorius III 416 624 626 652
 Newman, J.H. IV 109
 Nicolas, J. III 909 1010 1293
 Nicolau, M. IV 293
 Nicolas I III 170 402 427 470 612 629
 Nightingale III 1257
 Nisius, J.B. IV 232
 Nober, P. III 382
 Nobili-Vitelleschi III 1339

Noldin, H. IV 42
 Nothomb III 1007
Novatians III 1073 1074 1150 1186
 Nuytzi III 440

Oecumenius III 372
 Oepke, A. III 168 185
 Ogara, F. IV 50
 Olivi, P.J. de III 291 865
 Olivier, B. III 1127
 Onclin, W. III 939 1293
 Oñate, J.A. III 35 76; IV 217
 Optatus Milevitanus (St.) III 229 367
 414 427 435f 500 959 1073 1138
 1162
Oriental Schismatics III 26 29 166 171
 257 259 293 391 470f 494 548 598
 599 783 942 972 979 1093 1156
 1169 1179 1186 1216 1224 1242
 1245 1246 1247 1249 1250 1252
 1253 1254 1260 1261 1263 1264
 1338
 Origen III 75 173 176 234 303 314 355
 431 570 752 759 796 799 802 821
 1063 1102 1063 1102 1192; IV 29
 37 64 70f 122 143 202 212 266
 Ortiz de Urbina, I. III 1010
 Osma, P. de III 865
 Ottiger, Ig. III 20 33 117 151 161 225
 285 313 383 404 433 439 441 501
 520 538 803 936 1090 1148 1175
 1209 1215 1234 1254 1255 1259
 Ovidius, Publius N. III 886

Pacheco, P. IV 162
 Pachomius (St.) III 1238
 Paderbornensis, Bp. III 9 1339 1342
 Pagano, S. IV 78
 Palmer III 1126 1156
 Palmieri, D. III 20 117 151 161 208
 250 277 285 300 313 330 383
 439 441 459 498 501 525 529 540
 591 609 638 640 650 657 658 674

- 677 684 689 714 762 899 936 972
 1008 1015 1026 1052 1087 1090
 1113 1116 1122 1148 1209 1284
 1292 1344
Panchristians III 391 494 944 1007
 1051 1093 1125 1127 1156 1169
 1179 1245 1264. See *Ecumenists*.
Pannier, E. III 1183
Papadopoulos III 166 394
Papias III 315 431 751 796
Parente, P. III 23 33 899 1007 1026
 1052 1053
Paris, G.M. III 313 899
Parisot III 187 236
Parker III 1257
Parmensis III 1339
Paschasius, Bp. III 582
Paschasius Quesnel III 1075
Passaglia, C. III 20 277
Pastor, L. III 683
Patrizi III 373
Paulinus III 415
Paul III III 582
Paul IV IV 286
Paul V III 729
Pauly-Wissowa III 191 1290 1343
Peinador, M. IV 218
Pelagians III 1073
Pelagius I III 372 402 427 495 627
 1060
Pelagius II III 495 612
Pelster, F. III 851 856 864 871 880
Pelz, C. III 981
Peña, M. III 1054
Peñafort, R. (St.) III 1234
Perego, A. III 736
Pérez Ayala, M. III 911
Perler, O. III 413
Perrella, G.M. IV 2 50
Perrone, I. III 372f 442; IV 4
Pesch, Ch. III 22 151 277 313 372f 374
 430 638 641 650 655f 674 677 681
 684 689 698 803 806 836 841 845
 899 908 911 936 957 1026 1052
 1119 1209; IV 3 11 14 26 27 29 44
 56 75 79 82 92 106 108ff 113f 123
 125 128 130 135 136 138 140 145
 169 176 191f 206 218f
Pessimists III 290 295 1186
Petavius, D. III 330 371 372ff 838 972
Peters, N. IV 176
Petisco, I.M. IV 164
Petrus (St.) III 14 66 67
Petrus Ab. III 582
Peter Chrysologus (St.) III 435f 619
 823
Peter Claver (St.) III 1234
Peter Damian (St.) III 823
Peter Lombard III 852 854
Petrus, M. III 942
Petrus Pb. III 582
Pfister, O. III 1258
Philaretus Mokoviensis III 1051 1156
 1245
Philipon, M. III 928 1010
Philip IV P. III 942
Philip Pb. III 582
Philo IV 26 98 130
Philoxenus III 1032
Phillips-Crouzet III 1293
Phillips, G. III 24 1284 1293 1343
Photinus III 624
Photius III 166 170 402 470 599 629
 941 945
Pie, Bp. Pictavien. III 9 442 911
Pinard de la Boullaye III 754
Piolanti III 317 1010
Pirot, L. III 48 103 135 222 317 792
 797 1173; IV 32 158 280
Pirot-Bardy III 564
Pistoia, *Synod of* III 123 166 257 290
 2337 390 472 548 597 701 708
 729 861 944 1075 1128 1186
Pithous III 472
Pius IV III 582; IV 286
Pius V (St.) III 823 874

Pius VI III 130 294 723 729 861 945
 Pius VII III 402
 Pius VIII III 823
 Pius IX III 211 257 312 352 391 402
 416 427 440 475 495 550 551 552
 565 582 601 669 673 708 717 721
 726 729 744 760 823 861 895 920
 945 1010 1056 1094 1106 1126;
 IV 161
 Pius X III 28 41 44 128 130 293 392
 673 717 744 785 787 853 861 876
 877 881 1008 1010 1064; IV 22
 248 287
 Pius XI III 17 44 428 494 513 541 565
 725 759 760 823 826 866 876 877
 882 920 927 928 944 946 979 984
 1064 1093 1129 1130 1132 1235
 Pius XII III 17 34 84 97 128f 130 151ff
 171 198 211 260 284 335 345 352
 374 399 405 416 447 457 458 476
 514 541 552 565 568 692 696 708f
 725f 731 735f 744 756 760 787
 805 823 856 865 872 878f 882
 909 920 927 928 946 972 974 979
 984f 989 990 992 1006f 1010 1029
 1056ff 1075f 1093f 1129f 1132
 1345; IV 1 22 112 172 177f 187
 191 199 213 227 281 287
 Place III 151 912
 Plato Kijovenssis III 1156
 Plumpe, J.C. III 928
 Polliaco (de) J. III 865
 Polycarp (St.) III 368 751 818 844
 1163; IV 64 69
 Polycrates III 359
Pontifical, Roman III 1064
 Porphyry IV 115
 Poulpiquet III 24 1209
 Prado, J. IV 2 32 57 158 183 192 218
 Prat, F. III 75 330 371 372 972; IV 176
Presbyterians III 337 390 1251
Priscillianists III 424 621 625
 Priscillian III 424

Procovitch III 783
Professors of Biblical Institute IV 126
 Proiectus, Bp. III 582
Protestants III 26f 29 123 166 290ff
 293 317 337 390 430 494 510 548
 565 566 683 691 780 784 826 859
 861 919 943 945 970 1072 1074
 1077 1128 1150 1156 1157 1169
 1179 1186 1224 1242 1234 1244
 1245 1247 1248 1250 1251 1253
 1254 1255 1256 1257 1270 1271
 1292 1338 1343
Protestantism III 942 1230 1234
 Prudentius III 414 427 618
 Przywara, E. III 1007
 Puerto, G. III 1093
 Pufendorf III 123
Puritans III 1186
 Pusey III 1126 1156

Q
Quakers III 292
 Quenstedt, A. IV 130
 Quesnel, P. III 11238 1186; IV 284
Quietism III 981
 Quilliet, H. III 884

R
 Rabanos, FR. IV 90
 Rabeneck, I. III 1041
 Racine, Io. IV 268
 Rahner, H. III 928 1010
 Rahner, K. III 972 1007 1045
 Ramadié III 1339
 Rabaldi, G. III 754
 Ramírez, I.M. III 871
 Ramos III 316
 Ranft III 767
 Ranke III 178
Rationalism III 944 980 1270 and pas-
 sim.
Rationalists III 26 27 29 40 42 47f 92
 123 124 142 146 154 167 258 338
 342 393 511 691 700 708 717 743
 744 785 826 859 919 980 1128

1157 1179 1203
Ratisbonensis III 908f
 Rauschen, G. III 25
 Rauscher III 401 1339 1341
Regalists III 548 1338
 Regatillo, E.F. III 1223 1343
 Reginaldus Piper III 855
 Reichling, D. III 850
 Reinhard, W. III 28
 Reinhold, G. III 23
 Rengstorf, X. III 90 516
 Resch, A. III 173
 Reusch III 597
 Richer III 123 166 337 472 597
Richerians III 164 171
 Riedmann, A. III 24 151
Rigorists III 1186
 Rinetti, P. III 928
 Ritschl, A. III 92 125 154
Ritual, Roman III 1032 1041
 Riudor, I. III 1010
 Rivet III 912
 Rivière, J. III 28; IV 234
 Rivo, P. de III 865
 Robert, A. IV 2 196
 Robinson III 125
 Robleda, O. III 939
 Rodrigo, L. III 333 678 940 1016 1019
 1283
 Rohling, A. IV 108
 Rondet, H. III 1010
 Rosa, E. III 28
 Rosadini, S. III 13 175 797
 Roschini, G. III 1010
 Rosmini, A. de III 721
 Roulers, M. III 1290 1343
 Ruffini III 330 371 372
 Ruffino, G. III 638 641
 Rufinus III 650 821
 Ruwet, Io. IV 57

Sabatier III 43 154 1023 1128 1157
 Sadoc Szabor III 871

Sáenz de Aguirre III 591
 Sagüés, J. III 317 839
 Sailer, Io. IV 216
 Salambier, L. III 1278
 Salaverri, J. III 17 18 110f 127 160
 357 471 501 516 623 645 657 658
 669 677 71q1 786 795 805 820
 827 832 833 850 861 884 909 810
 922 936 979 1023 1161 1163 1175
 1184 1196 1207 1284 1305 1342ff
 Sales, M. III 564; IV 169
 Salmerón, A. IV 160
Salamonis Odae III 176
 Samuel Taius III 852
 Sanday, W. IV 109
 Sanderus III 1150
 Santamaria, J.A. III 775
 Santos Olivera, B. IV 125
 Sanz, F.M. III 1127
 Sarabia, J.M. III 394
 Sauras, E. III 972 1009 1010 1016
 1026 1032 1045 1054 1067
 Savi, P. IV 109
 Scaglia III 244
 Schamasch III 191
 Scheeben, M.I. III 638 674 899 908
 911 1010 1284 1292
 Scheel, O. IV 45
 Schenkl, H. III 851
 Schepens III 179
 Schiffini, S. III 674 899; IV 3 110
 Schill III 313
 Schlagenhaufen, F. III 23 151 373 429
 908 1026 1318; IV 4 97 106 118
 121
 Schlegel III 291
 Schlund, R. III 9
 Schmid, F. IV 140
 Schmid, J. III 136 303
 Schmidt, A. III 760
 Schmidt, K.L. III 141 142 148 150f
 154 175 177 185 342 566
 Schneemann, G. III 638; IV 78

- Schnitzer III 41 154 173
 Schouppe, F.X. IV 4
 Schrader, C. III 20 501 813
 Schuerer III 145
 Schuetz III 92
 Schulte III 597
 Schultes, R.M. III 1 22 35 117 151
 161 313 383 441 459 498 501 506
 591 638 658 674 684 698 714 720
 738 754 766 767 813 836 842 845
 871 879 884 899 908 914 930 936
 1026 1052 1053 1068 1087 1113
 1119 1168 1209 1212 1216 1284
 1292
 Schultze III 1169
 Schulz-Fink III 1240
 Schwartz III 357
 Schwarzenberg III 912
 Schweitzer, A. III 41
 Schweigl, J. 1246
 Scio, Ph. IV 164
 Sebastián, F. IV 218
 Sebastianus (St.) III 432
 Seeberg, R. III 169 179
 Segarra, F. III 70 72 74 76 214
 Segismundus Ip. III 582
 Segna, F. III 22
 Semeris, J. IV 109
Semiariani III 621
Semi-Rationalism III 669
Semi-Rationalists III 511 668 700 717
 743 744 860 865
 Semler, J.S. IV 74
 Semmelroth, O. III 24 1010
 Senestrey (Ratisbone) III 909f.
 Serapion de Thmuis IV 19
 Seufert III 92
 Severus Ant. III 1032
 Sheen, F. III 972
 Sickenberger, J. III 179
 Silva-Tarouca III 454 623 633 650 652
 654 941
 Silvester I (St.) III 421 427 582 621
 Silvius III 373
 Silvius Dux III 1064
 Simeon III 48
 Simón, H. III 37 53 75f 103 221; IV 2
 32 158
 Simor, Bp. III 552 907 911f
 Simplicius III 611 622
 Siri, G. III 24
 Siricius (St.) III 401 424ff 427
 Sixtus V III 656 681 823 861 1230; IV
 166 286
 Sobnam III 192
Socialists III 944
Socinians III 290
 Socott, S.H. III 1249
 Socrates, historian III 650
 Soederblom III 291
 Sofia Bonat (St.) III 1235
 Soglia, I. III 1293
 Sohm III 93 127 169 341 394
 Soiron, Th. III 972 981
 Solano, J. III 1184
 Soloviev III 170
 Soltau III 167 173
 Solyman III 191
 Sotillo Rod, L. III 939 1284 1292 1336
 1343
 Soto, D. III 441
 Sozomenos III 650
 Spácil, Th. III 25 391 598 638 1054
 1186 1215
 Specht, Th. III 313; IV 4
 Spedalieri III 705 726
 Spiazzi, R. III 738 754
 "Spiritualis" III 291 1022
Spiritualists III 42 92 142
 Stanislaus Kostka (St.) III 725
 Stapleton, Th. III 19 1168
Statists III 945
 Stegmüller-Koster III 735 805
 Steidle, B. III 813 1345
 Steinmüller, J.E. IV 2
 Steinwenter III 1290 1343

Stentrup, F.A. IV 3f
 Stephanus (St.) III 68 401 1273
 Stephanus Pap. III 620
 Stepahnus Bp. III 582
 Stephanus, Rob. III 13
 Stickler, A.M. III 401 939
 Stolz, A. III 23 638 641 899 908 1010
 1016 1026 1045 1052 1053 1068
 1284 1293
 Stolz, W. III 127
 Stonner, A. IV 284
 Strack, H. III 136 145 169 177 186 191
 361 1062
 Strack-Billerbeck III 135f 145 169 177
 186 191 361 1062
 Sträter, P. III 1010
 Straub, A. III 20 117 151 161 208 212
 250 255 297 285 305 310 313 383
 433 441 447 459 491 499 527 528
 540 591 609 638 640 657 658 674
 675 678 684 698 762 899 908 914
 929 936 972 1016 1019 1026 1045
 1052 1053 1087 1090 1148 1168
 1192 1209 1279 1284 1292 1344
 Streit, C. III 1239
 Strotmann III 165
 Suarez, F. III 8 18 35 88 117 151 158
 161 250 277 285 330 374 383 439
 441 491 501 540 591 593 657 658
 684 698 726 728 738 767 848 855
 884 936 972 1016 1024 1036 1037
 1040 936 972 1016 1024 1036
 1037 1040 1043 1049 1052 1054
 1068 1093 1119 1148 1168 1209
 1284 1291 1330 1342; IV 169 205
 Suermondt III 855
 Suhard, E. IV 180
 Sulpicius Severus III 315
 Sundar Singh III 1258
 Sutcliff, E.F. IV 218
 Swedenborg III 292
 Swete III 150 357
 Sylbius, F. III 913

Syllabus III 701

SYMBOLS:

—*Apostolic* III 1152
 —*Chalcedon* III 622
 —*Council of Lyons* III 1152
 —*Leo IX* III 1152
 —*Nicaea* III 696
 —*Nicene-Constant.* III 1152
 —*Trent* III 696 1152
Synod of Pistoia III 597 723 729

T*almud* III 135; IV 61

Tamburini III 440

Tanner, A. III 18 441

Tanqueray, Ad. III 23 151 899 908
 1016 1026 1052 1053; IV 4

Taoist-Sintoists III 1224

Tarasius III 402

Tarquini, C. III 1292 1344

Tatian III 174 178f 821

Teixeira Leite, M. III 151 972

Temiño, A. IV 218

Teppa, A.M. III 907

Teppe, G.B. IV 4

Teresa (St.) III 1234

Thérèse of Infant Jesus (St.) III 1235

Ternant, P. IV 219

Terrien, J.B. III 110 1030 1052

Tertullian III 141 173 176 226 284 291
 315 355 358 367 394 412 427 431
 435ff 509 570 617 620 750 751
 752 762 767 783 796 802 803 804
 821 834 886 1022f 1033 1060
 1162 1181 1192 1227 1245 1257;
 IV 59 55 64 70f 98 130 266

Theiner, A. IV 110

Theodoretus III 372 652 835; IV 39

Theodosius I III 422 427 582

Theodosius II III 582 941

Theophilus of Antioch (St.) III 1192;
 IV 35 69

Theophylactus III 372

Thiel III 626

Thielen III 405
 Thils, G. III 1093 1150 1209 1212 1217
 1267 1268 1269 1271
 Thomas Aquinas (St.) III 8 18 35 46
 70 72 74 76 110f 155-158 160 203
 219 284 299 303 312 349 371 372
 450 488 501 536 540 546 564 591
 673 684 687 536 540 546 564 591
 673 684 687 688 697f 701 718
 726 729 730 738 747 756 758 762
 767 770 823 842 848 855 871 872
 873 874 875 877 878 879 880 881
 882 883 889 913 915 927 930 931
 936 972 975 979 987 990 992 997
 1000 1016 1020 1021 1024 1025
 1039 1041 1043 1044 1047 1048
 1049 1063 1065 1087 1087 1103
 1104 1106 1148 1150 1182 1184
 1234 1277 1281 1284 1289 1290
 1291 1298 1306 1307 1308 1313;
 IV 91 113 125 146 169 188 195
 203 209 215 217ff 254
Thomism III 881
 Timotheus III 375
 Tixeront III 314
 Toledo, F. de III 18 213 855 972
 Tomkins, O.S. III 391
 Torres Amat, F. IV 164
 Tournely III 313 472
 Trevisensis III 912
 Tricot, A. IV 2 196
 Tromp, S. III 76 151 487 506 800 928
 972 990 1006 1007 1010 1040
 1061 1276 1293; IV 3 11 75 93 106
 109 113 123 136 141 167
 Tryphon IV 64
 Turmel III 394
 Turner III 357
 Turrado, L. III 371; IV 218f 259
 Turrecremata, I. de III 18 277 383 884
 1052 1292 1342
 Tuybaerts, M. III 899
 Tyrrell, G. III 41

Tyszkiewicz, S. III 24 26 1209

Ultricuria, N. de III 717 865

Urban I III 1025

Urban VIII III 656 682 719 1230

Urrutia III 1257

Vacandard III 683 970

Vacant, A. III 13 178 681; IV 148 166
 218f 230

Valencia, G. de III 18 441 855 913 1054

Valentini, E. III 1212

Valerga III 1333 1341 1342

Vallois, R. III 191

Van Cauwelaert III 417

Vancsa III 1333

Van de Eynde III 411 767 803

Van der Heeren, A. IV 125

Van Espen III 472

Van Laak, H. III 33 151 313 318 324
 372 382 383 404 459 472f 486 501
 507 638 658 867 914 1052 1053
 1083 1090 1148 1167 1168 1209;
 IV 3 106 113 140

Van Noort, G. III 23 151 313 638 714
 899 1008 1026 1052 1053 1148
 1209; IV 3f

Van Roo, W.A. III 1106

Vansteenberghe, E. III 1278

Vázquez, G. III 18 374 855; IV 205

Vega, A. III 414; IV 160

Velázquez III 191

Velleius III 886

Vellico, A.M. III 22 330 372 374 596f
 638 714 899 1016 1026 1030 145
 1052 1293

Vermeersch, A. III 259 390 597

Vetero-catholici III 259 390 597

Vianney, John (St.) III 1235

Victor I III 173 359 393 418 620

Victoria, F. de III 18 250 277 374 913

Victorinus Petav. III 315

Vidal III 573

Vigilius III 582 627 651 652 653
 Vigouroux, F. IV 57
 Villanova (S.Th. a) III 1234
 Vincent Ferrer (St.) III 1234
 Vincentius Pb. III 582
 Visser't Hooft, W. III 391
 Vitalis III 415
 Vitus Pb. III 582
 Vodopivec, J. III 382 458 1007
 Vögt, A. III 382
 Volaterranus III 1331
 Von Dunin-Borkowski, St. III 24
 Von Gelnhausen III 471
 Von Harnack, Ad. III 40 43 92f 124
 126 151 154 167 174 176 178f 340
 393f 404 430 433 821 1023 1128
 1157 1200
 Von Hummelauer, F. IV 176
 Von Ketteler III 1331
 Von Langensein III 471
 Von Pastor, L. III 1278
 Vosté, I. IV 3 168 180
 Vrede, W. IV 32

Walafridus Strabo III 987
Waldensians III 1074
 Walenburch, P. III 803
 Walter, F. III 1293 1343
 Weimer III 1023
 Weincl, H. III 40
 Weiss, I. III 41 92
 Weizsäcker, K. III 95 125 346 430
 Wendland III 94 151 154 169 342
 Wernz, F.X. III 573 1049 1291 1292
 SWernz-Vidal III 864 1237 1283 1284
 1336
 Wesley III 1257
 Wycliffe, J. III 166 257 290 337 390
 510 721 784 859 861 865 885 942
 1022 1072 1186 1257
 Wieser III 291
 Wikenhauser, A. III 972 981
 Willpert, G. III 244

Wilmers, G. III 22 33 88 117 151 250
 277 285 302 313 330 372 383 404
 441 540 591 638 658 674 679 684
 698 701 738 884 899 908 914 929
 972 1008 1013 1016 1025 1026
 1045 1052 1053 1113 1119 1128
 1167 1168 1209 1215 1292

Windisch, H. III 179

Wirceburgenses III 899 1026

Workmann, H.B. III 784

Xavier, F. (St.) III 1234

Xiberta, B.M. III 1

Zahn, Th. III 95 179 404; IV 68

Zanini de Solc. III 865

Zankow, St. III 166 291 391 598 979
 1051 1093 1127 1156 1215 1245

Zannecchia, D. IV 3 176 205

Zapelena, T. III 22 35 40 64 74 75 76
 88 117 151 159 161 180 227 249
 250 285 288 303 313 330 371 374
 381 404 491 501 507 540 591 638
 640 684 698 734 735 737 767 805f
 819 830 832 908 914 916 972
 1000 1006 1026 1045 1052 1067
 1090 1107 1111 1119 1138 1143
 1150 1168 1174 1193 1209 1212
 1217 1218 1224 1239 1243 1244
 1245 1246 1253 1264 1267 1278
 1280 1284 1291f 1307 1336 1344

Zarb, S.M. IV 50 57

Zinelli III 398 639 642 657

Zorell, F. III 37 90 142 186 102 224
 300 361 520 564 769 922; IV 31
 126

Zosimus III 402 427 581 611

Zubizarreta, V. III 23 151 313 638 684
 798 1026 1052 1053; IV 4

Zwingli III 1254

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

N.B. The Roman numerals designate the *treatise* and the Arabic. the *marginal* numbers.

Acacian dissension III 622.

"Ad Sinarum gentem," Encycl. of Pius XII of the powers of the Church to the Primacy III 130 374 476 514 692 744.

Advent of the Lord, future III 539

Anathemas of the Councils III 911-913.

"Angels" in the book of Revelation 355ff 361f.

Apocryphal books IV 57.

Apostate III 1047; not a member of the Church III 1055-1061.

Apostolate as a criterion of inspiration IV 50; apostolate of St. Paul III 106-109.

Apostles their election III 13; their infallibility 526ff 537ff; inasmuch as they could not know some things 67; their understanding of the deposit of faith 762; their authority with Peter and under Peter 278ff. 280ff; their extra-ordinary gifts 255 277ff; witnesses of revelation 748ff; their successors are the Bishops 330-382.

"Apostle" III 90; Apostle of the Gentiles 69.

Apostleness is a property of the Church III 1176-1181 1201ff; it is a note of the Roman Church 1226f; of it alone 1253-1277.

Archeological monuments of Peter III 244f 432 438.

Argument of prescription III 803; also from the Fathers III 836-841.

Arian controversies III 421ff 427

Ark of Noah, image of the Church III 1103f.

Assent due to the decrees of the Holy See III 666-673; its nature 674ff 678; to the definition of virtually revealed things 714.

Assistance of the Holy Spirit III 505 709; distinguished from revelation and inspiration 506.

Assumption, dogma of III 696 909.

"Auctorem fidei," Const. of Pius VI against the Synod of Pistoia III 130 166 294 337 390 472 548 597 708 723 729 861 944f 1075 1077.

Authenticity what it is and how many forms IV 148; of the Vulgate III 681, IV 149-165; of other texts 166ff.

Baptism of water, blood, desire, correctly, validly, fruitfully conferred III 1021; valid is required and suffices to be a member of the Church III 1027-1033; it is necessary that it be valid 1034 1044.

Bishops III 335 338-342 371-374; successors of the Apostles 330-355; monarchical 335 344 356-370; titular and residential 542; who are infallible 542; in harmony with the Roman Pontiff 543; under what conditions infallibility is given 544 547; they receive immediate jurisdiction from the Pope 374.

Body and soul of the Church III 113-1118.

Book, inspired what it is IV 11-16; whether one could perish 56; canonical book, what it is 16; history of the canon 57-74; Liber Pontificalis III 360 435f.

Books, canonical IV proto and deuter-
 Canon IV 57.

Canon Esdrinus, Palestinian IV 60;
 Alex-andrian 62.

Canons of Vatican I III 911-913.

Canonization of saints III 705 724-26
 734ff; proves the holiness of the
 Church 1230-1235; it is an object
 of infallibility 725f.

Chapters of Trent and Vatican I are
 definitions III 906-912.

Catalogue of the Apostles III 92 102;
 of Bishops III 348-351; Liberian
 catalogue III 360 435f.

Catechism of Trent III 982ff 1009
 1039 1057 1306.

Catholicity is a property of the Church
 III 1163-1175 1198ff; it is a note
 of the Roman Church 1224f; of her
 alone 1247-1253.

Censure or propositions III 886-905.

Certain proposition infallibly III 891
 905; theologically 888 905; in the-
 ology 904f.

Chair of Peter III 227 229 413 415
 437f.

Christ has a threefold messianic office
 III 34 1285 1297 1299 1302 1304-
 1307 1344; Head of the Church
 975 982 985 989; authentic and in-
 fallible Teacher 516ff; established
 the Church 137.

Church what it is III 143-150 155-158;
 origin and meaning of the word
 142-150, 155-158; in the broad
 and strict sense 1040ff; gather-
 ing together of the predestined or
 saints 123; collegial 125; demo-
 cratic 126; charismatic 127 341;
 tripartite 494; monarchical 161-
 249; militant, suffering, trium-

phant 149 154f; in Jerusalem 40
 185; primitive 184; of the angels
 1550; Petrine, Pauline, Johannine
 291; of three branches 494.

Church is an article of faith III 6; col-
 umn and foundation of truth 564-
 568; mystical body of Christ 973-
 996; quasi other person of Christ
 990; house of the sons of God 977
 984f 999f; house of God the Father
 996; temple of the Holy Spirit 996;
 Mother of the faithful 928; motive
 of credibility 276f; Roman Church
 is creator of ecclesiastical law 341.

Church soul of or quasi-soul is the
 Holy Spirit III 976 983 985 990-
 993 1007-1015; does not have a
 created soul 1009; body and soul
 1113-1118; subjects 1019; end
 914-935; institution 4 117-141;
 when instituted 151ff; primary law
 1285-1303; magisterium 503-737;
 members 1016-1059; relation to
 Mary 1010; supernatural nature
 927f; as a perfect and independent
 society 4 165 927-971; necessary
 for salvation 1089-1112; notes
 1211-1275; origin 11 155 158 339;
 its power divided into two kinds,
 but really and specifically three are
 distinguished 1284-1343; proper-
 ties 10 1121-1208.

Church, house of the sons of God III
 977 984f 994f.

Citations implicit and explicit in Holy
 Scripture IV 176 186.

Codex Syro-sinaiticus III 175; of Fulda
 178.

College of Apostles III 88-105 254.

Comma, Johannine IV 158 249.

Conciliarism III 471 596.

Conclusion, theological III 701 716f
 730 735f 888 898 904.

Condition of succession in the primacy III 387 397f 443 449.

Congregations, Roman III 660 673; Holy Office 661 664.

Consensus of the Fathers III 824f; criterion of Tradition 827-835; required conditions 836f; of theologians 858 861; criterion of Tradition 863-866.

Constitution social of the Church III 36.

Corinthian schism 417 427.

Council what it is III 545; particular, plenary, provincial, diocesan 545f 581.

Council, ecumenical its idea III 576; current law 573; theological foundation 574; jurisdiction 466 476; power 575; convocation 577; conditions 578; confirmation 579; number and names 582; infallibility 550 554-559 636-644.

Covenant, New III 14.

Credenda III 909-13.

Credibility motive of is per se the Church herself III 1276f.

Criterion of Tradition what it is and how many III 815f; primary is the Magisterium of the Church 815; secondary but certain consensus of the Fathers 813-844; consensus of theologians is a criterion 863-866.

Deacons III 339f 368.

Declaration of Gallican clergy III 472.

Decrees of Councils III 581.

Decrees, pseudo-Isidorian III 394.

Decrees of the Holy See how many kinds III 660; force and nature of indirect decrees 661-664; of direct doctrinal 664; virtual decrees 665; disciplinary 703f 722f; decrees of Congregations and of the Biblical

Committee IV 248f.

Definition ex cathedra III 594.

Deposit of faith III 689 692 787 909.

Discernment of private revelations and their authority III 761.

Disciple of Christ III 90.

Divine right III 334 342-349; of the hierarchy 367f; of the primacy 397f; of the primacy of the Holy See 427.

"Divini illius Magistri," Encycl. of Pius XI III 513 565 920 927 928 984.

Divinity of Christ III 185 225; proved apologetically 32f; presupposed for the treatise on the Church 31f; why it is treated in Fundamental Theology 31ff.

Doctors of the Church III 822f.

Doctrine, Catholic III 892f 905; to be believed 909-913; infallibly certain 891 905; on faith and morals 702 890; safe 661-64 677; to be held 909-913.

Doctrine that must be held III 909-13.

Dogma of faith III 896f 905.

Doubts expressed in Scripture IV 124.

Economy, threefold III of the Father in the O.T., of the Son in the N.T., of the Holy Spirit III 706 727ff.

Election of the Apostles III 100f; of the Supreme Pontiff 447.

End of the kingdom of God III 55-56; of the Church 914-935.

Episcopate origin III 338-342; collegial 352; Roman 387; Roman of St. Peter 433-438.

Error in divine faith III 887 905; in defined faith 900; in Catholic faith 901 905; theological 888 905; con-

cerning faith 890 905; in infallibly certain doctrine 891 905; in Catholic doctrine 892f 905; in ecclesiastical faith 899 901.

Eschatologism in expectation of a messianic kingdom III 38-41 52 93 142 317 343.

Evolution natural and free III 358-362.

Excommunication III 1049; as it destroys a member of the Church 1050 1055ff 1062-1065ff.

"Eximiam tuam," Brief of Pius IX on Semi-Rationalists III 708 743 744 785 861.

Facts, dogmatic III 702 718-721; doctrinal are objects of infallibility 718-721.

Faith of Peter III 197f 203 241; alone is not sufficient for a member of the Church 1043.

Faith, ecclesiastical III 899ff.

Fathers of the Church notion III 817-820; distinguished from others 821f; their consensus is a criterion of Tradition 824f; conditions of consent 836-841; recognized by the Councils 827f; are witnesses of faith 830; authentic Doctors 831; their consensus in the interpretation of Scripture 841, IV 250 255; their authority in determining the author of a sacred book 256-259; in determining the literary genre 260ff; in determining messianic texts 263; their words extolling the value of Holy Scripture 274-278.

Fonts of revelation III 769 909; primary is tradition 778; are distinguished from the Magisterium 779 805f and theological notes 886-905.

"Formgeschichte," method of III 168

181-185.

Forms, literary in Holy Scripture IV 176 188f.

Foundations of the Church are the Apostles III 255.

Galileo, condemnation of III 682f.

Gates of Hell III 303.

"Gemeindetheologie" III 181-185.

Gentiles incorporation in the Church III 66-67.

Genuineness literary 173-180; historical Matt. 16:16-19 181-185 207; of John 21 212ff 246.

Gospel must be preached first to the Jews, then to the Gentiles III 67; gospel of the Hebrews 178.

"Gravissimas inter," Letter of Pius IX on the doctrine of Frohschammer III 708 717 743 744 785 865.

Heretic III 1047f; is not a member of the Church 1055 1056ff 1059ff 1065f; heretical proposition 895ff 905.

Hermeneutics what it is and how many forms IV 192-194.

Heuristics IV 104 226-266; literary criteria to find the meaning of Holy Scripture 227 230; dogmatic criteria 231-266.

Hierarchy III 121ff 127 287; its inequality 122; its perpetuity 285 306-310; of divine law 345 347-355; one or twofold 344.

History of treatise on the Church III 16ff.

Holiness is a property of the Church III 1182-1192 1204-1208; is a note of the Roman Church 1228-1240; of her alone 1254-1263; not required to constitute a member of the Church 1070-1086.

Honorius, doctrine of III 654f 680.

"Humani generis" Encyclical, III passim especially in "Doctrine on the Church"; 17 171 514 623 668 669 692 700 708 709 717 731 735 744 756 759 787 805 865 878 1007 1094; IV 112 171 180 188 199 203 232 235.

Imprecations in Holy Scripture IV 125.

"In Ecclesia Christus" III 1345.

Indifferentism III 1007.

"Ineffabilis Deus," Bull of Pius IX on the Immaculate III 565 696 760 1010 1056.

Inerrancy of Scripture IV 169-174; what to think about absolute truth in Scripture 175-191.

Infallibility in Magisterium of the Church III 505; its distinction from revelation and inspiration 506; of the Apostles 255 526ff 537ff; of Bishops 541-581; of the teaching Church 549; of Councils 550 554-559; of the ordinary magisterium of Bishops 551f 554-557 560-563; reconciled with the fallibility of individuals 584; with freedom in consenting 584; with the previous search for truth 585; with impossibility of obligating to internal acts 586; of the Supreme Pontiff 591-656; its subject whether only one 636-644; its object 685-729; primary 684-699; secondary 700-737; its comparison with the infallibility of the Church 649; two forms 645-648.

Infallibly certain III 891 905.

Inspiration of the sacred books—what it is and how it is proved IV 10-12; its criterion 43-55; its nature

75-104; reduced to a prophetic gift 76; differs from revelation 103; and from assistance III 506; its elements in man IV 85-100; its extension 105-122; verbal inspiration in the sense of mechanical dictation 128-135; "psychological" verbal inspiration 136-146.

Interpretation of Holy Scripture is the object of Hermeneutics IV 192; seeks the meaning of Scripture 193-225; Trent and Vatican I on it 233ff; law of the Church on interpreting what are not of faith and morals 239-243; authority of interpreters 266.

Introduction, biblical IV 1ff; its relation to fundamental theology 4.

James the lesser III 363.

Judgment, last III 49 52 57.

Jurisdiction what it is III 163; how many forms 463 480; mediated of Bishops 374 476; immediate of the Primacy, truly episcopal, ordinary, universal, supreme and full 459 462-469 475-488; internal and external forums 1311; in a generic sense 1290f 1294 1330 1334 1337 1341f; specific 1292 1332f 1338 1342f.

Kahal III 144 148 150.

Kepha III 177.

Kerygmatic consideration of Holy Scripture IV 267-294.

Key of the house of David III 192.

Kingdom III 31 37-44; messianic 12 61 154; of God 37 154; preached to the people of Israel 13; constituted with a social form in the Church 14; endowed with fullness of power 15; universal 38ff 47-51; escha-

tological 38f 41 52; on earth 38f 53f 299; internal and spiritual 38f 42f 55-59 81ff; external and visible 38f 61ff; kingdom of heaven 37 188.

Lamentabili” Decree against Modernists III 44 128 392 668 669 673 708 717 743 744 785 865 1179.

Lapis angularis III 205.

Law of succession of divine right III 387.

Law, old III 56 58 84-87 111 112; figurative and a promise of the new Law 112; New is promulgated 13 56 58 111 112; of Christ conferred on Peter 245 409; of succession 387 397 443 449; primary of the Church 1285-1303.

Legate divine III 89; legation of Christ committed to the Church 90 132.

“Legem credendi lex statuit supplicandi” III 760.

Liberii subscription III 650 680.

Liberty of science III 731.

Luke medical doctor, author of the third Gospel, silent about the promise of the Primacy III 235.

Magisterium of the Church notion III 503; teaching and attesting 503; authentic 504; infallible 505; written, living, traditional 507; is a proximate rule of faith 781; primary criterion of Tradition 815; relation to theological notes 886-905; its role in the interpretation of Holy Scripture IV 232-243.

Magisterium, authentic notion III 504; institution 501-539; ordinary and extra-

ordinary exercise 544 546; purely authentic of the Holy See 658-676.

Magisterium, infallible a) institution III 517-525; in Ecumenical Council 550 554-559; ordinary how exercised 583; necessity 587; b) extraordinary of the Roman Pontiff 594-644; ordinary 647f; c) multiple objects 686f; direct 688f; indirect 690-698; in general 702; according to Vat. I 703-708; as formally revealed 709-713 730f; as virtually revealed 714 717 732-737; concerning dogmatic facts 718-721; concerning disciplinary decrees 722f; concerning canonization of Saints 724f; concerning Religious Orders 727ff.

“Magnificate Dominum,” Allocution of Pius XII on the Priesthood and Governing of the Church III 34 1295 1303.

Mark disciple of Peter, author of second Gospel, silent about the promise of the Primacy III 235; relates the prediction about Peter 235.

Mary, Virgin her relation to the mystical Body III 1010; as Mediatrix, Coredemptrix she is the type, mother and queen of the Church 1010; she is like the neck or maternal heart of the Church 1010.

Matthew apostle, author of first Gospel, his Gospel is a genuine source in the treatise on the Church III 13ff; on the promise of the Primacy 181ff.

“Mediator Dei,” Encycl. of Pius XII on the Liturgy III 153 352 760 1305.

Meletiana controversy III 423.

Member of mystical Body of Christ III 998; of the Church 1018-1021;

various opinions of theologians 1024ff 1052ff; are all and only the validly baptized 1028ff 1031-1034 1043f; heretics and formal and manifest schismatics are not 1056ff 1059ff 1065f; nor are the perfectly excommunicated 1056ff 1062-1064; reason of member differs from reason of subject 1065; what is required for it 1035-1038; predestination or holiness not required 1070-1086.

Messiah Christ III 185; messianic powers 96 110 1304.

Metaphors of Primacy III 186-197 233; of rock 1892 201 204f; of keys 191f; of binding-loosing 193f.

Method dogmatic in treatise on the Church III 6 18; apologetic 7; empirical 7ff; illative 10; historical 11; historical-illative 10.

Millenarism III 314-317 830 844.

Miracle the Church is a moral miracle III 7 1276f.

"Mortalium animos," Encycl. of Pius XI on Ecumenism III 17 494 946 979 1093 1129 1130 1132w.

Motive of credibility, the Church is per se III 1276f.

"Munificentissimus Deus," Bull of Pius XII on the Assumption III 352 552 565 696 760 909.

Mystical Body of Christ notion III 973-977; is the Church 987f; and indeed the Roman Catholic Church 1006f; whose Head is Christ 975 982 985 989; and the Holy Spirit is its quasi-soul 976 983 985 990-993 1008-1015; according to S. Thomas 997-1000; according to Vatican I 1001-1006; its relation to Mary 1010.

"Mystici Corporis," Encycl., passages quoted III passim in "Doctrine of the Church" III 17 34 97 128 129 151 152 211 260 284 345 399 478 514 920 927 928 946 972 979 980 981 985 989 990 1006 1007 1008 1010 1029 1056 1057 1058 1075 1076 1129 1130 1132 1284 1285 1295 1296 1299 1301 1302 1343 1345.

Myth IV 188.

Necessity of the Church for salvation III 1089; of means 1090-1100 1105-1112; of precept 1101.

Nestorian controversy III 423.

New Covenant instituted by Christ III 86; whereby the Old Covenant was substituted and abrogated 84-87; excellence over the Old 87; fullness of the Old 111f.

New Testament its use in Apologetics III 12; its relation to O.T. 323.

Noematics IV 194-225.

Notes of the Church what and how many III 1211-1214; opinions of theologians on the notes 1217ff; one, catholic, apostolic, holy are the notes 1221; of the Roman Church 1222-1241; of her alone 1241-1263; note of Romanness 498f; of Peterness 499.

Notes, theological III 886.

Obiter dicta IV 105; inspiration extended to it 106-122.

Obligation to the Church III 1019.

Office conferred in hierarchic way III 306-31; delegated 332f; proper 333; vicarious 333; ordinary and extra-ordinary 332f; purpose of teaching, ruling and sanctifying is sal-

vation 924ff; specific distinction 1034-1343.

Old Testament III 144f 150 154; its use in apologetics 12; its abrogation 84-87; announces the kingdom of God 47f; it is figurative and promissory of the N.T. 111f; replaced by the N.T. 84-87.

On faith in general III 889 891 905; divine 887 905; divine and Catholic 894f 897 905 909; defined 900 905; defined divine 896 905; strictly Catholic 901 905; ecclesiastical 899 901.

Parables III 13 46 51 52 54 56; parable of the good shepherd 220f.

Parousia of Christ III 70-72 73f.

"Pascendi," Encycl. of Pius X on Modernists III 44 181 392 511 708 743 744 785 861 944.

Pasture the flock of Christ III 217 224.

Pasch, day of III 359 418-427.

Paul, Apostle acknowledged the primacy of Peter III 272-276; even though he resisted him to his face 275f 283f; equal to the other Apostles 106-109; Apostle of the Gentiles 274f; and of Jews 286; personally infallible 527f.

Pelagian controversy III 423.

Perfection, Christian III 56-60 1228-1241.

Perpetuity of the Church III 39 285-305; proved from the O.T. 313.

Peter compared to Moses by St. Augustine III 232; and in archeology 244f; as Shepherd 245; as first he is the Superior of the Apostles 250-284; his primacy 161-249; extraordinary powers 458; his Roman Episcopate 433-438; his martyr-

dom in Rome 429-432; Petrinism 258.

Power III 119; proper and vicarious 252f; delegated 252 254; ordinary and extraordinary 254ff; triple 121; of teaching, ruling and sanctifying 119; power of authority and excellence in Christ 96 110 1304; universal power of the Apostles 255 277ff; legislative power of the Church 940 952-956 963f; judicial 940 952-956 965; coercive 940 952-956 966-971; the power of the Church is really and specifically threefold 1304-1327; doctrine of Vatican Council I 1328-1343; extraordinary powers of the Apostles 382; of Peter 458.

Principality greater Roman III 410f.

Predestination not required to constitute a member of the Church III 1070-1086.

Preambles of faith III 701 716f 730 911f.

Prescription, argument of III 803f.

Presbyters III 339f 368 371-374.

Primacy III 163f: a) nature of 311; power and reason 278f; universality 311; superiority 459 468f 478 485; perpetuity 285 311f; purpose of 312;

b) promised to and conferred on Peter 161-249; signified under a triple metaphor 186-206; included in the office of feeding the whole flock of Christ 208-249; recognized by the holy Fathers 226-243; c) conferred on the Roman Pontiff 400-427; proved independently of the Roman episcopacy of Peter 428; connection of the Primacy with the Roman See 431-447.

Priscillian controversy III 424 427.

Progress, dogmatic III 755; how many kinds 756; in the proposition of the Magisterium 757; in the understanding of believers 758; its cause 759; occasion 760.

Procatemene tes agapes III 403-409.

Propositions their value and censure III 886-905; of Jansen 719.

Properties of the Church what and how many III 1121 1151; oneness 1122 1124-1127 1129 1131-1135 1139-1142; formal and distinct visibility 1123f 1128 1130ff 1136ff 1143-1147; simultaneous, perpetual, moral catholicity 1163-1175 1198ff; apostolicity of formal succession 1176-1181 1202ff; apostolicity of material succession 1220 1226f; ontological holiness 1182f; moral, perfect, heroic 1182-1192 1204-1208.

Qualifications, theological III 886; ample explanation 884-912.

Reading of Scripture regulated by the Church IV 284; never generally forbidden 285; sometimes restricted 286; recommended by the Church 287f; practical way of reading 289-294.

Rebaptism of heretics III 410 427 620.

Religion III revealed 3.

Revelation what and how many forms III 740; completed with the Apostles 741-753; private revelation and dogmatic progress 761; primary source of revelation is Tradition 778 789-796; revelation is distinguished from the assistance of the Holy Spirit 506; only a twofold source of revelation, Scripture and Tradition 767-804; both clearly

distinguished from the Magisterium 805.

Roman stay of St. Peter III 429-432.

Roman Pontiff its notion III 593; primacy 383-458; definition ex cathedra 594; its infallibility described 595; proposed in Vatican I 599ff; it is proved 603-635; how many ways exercised 645-648; his possible personal heresy 447 596 657; his universal ordinary power, truly episcopal, supreme and full 460-484; no other judgment on earth is superior to his 485.

Rule of faith III 780f 787 806.

Salvation supernatural is the purpose of the Church III 914-935.

Sanctification is the purpose of the Church III 914-935.

"Sapientiae Christianae," Encycl. of Leo XIII: III 352 399 513 692 886 928 946.

"Satis cognitum" Encyclical some part quoted passim III, especially in "Doctrine of the Church" III 11 17 33 48 97 128 129 136 171 260 268 294 305 312 345 399 476 478 513 607 920 927 946 974 1006 1109 1129 1130 1132 1133 1135 1295 1296 1298 1301 1303 1343 1345.

Schism, Western III 471 1278-1283; it was not a true schism 1066 1281.

Schismatic III 1048; not a member of the Church 1055 1056ff 1059-1061 1065ff.

School theological schools III 856 866; just freedom and honorable rivalry concerning opinions granted to them 881f.

Scripture is a source of revelation III 768f 778-781 797-802; its dog-

matic fundamental treatment IV 4f; its excellence 6ff; its reading 284-294.

Secretaries, hagiographic IV 100 146.
Sede vacante III 448.

"Sempiternus Rex," Encycl. of Pius XII on the Council of Chalcedon III 458 631 1007 1093.

Sense of Holy Scripture what and how many forms IV 193 195-198; the literal sense 199-203; only one 204-209; and typical 21-216; probative power of it 217; full meaning 94 218ff; following sense 221; accommodated sense 222; the sense "which holy mother Church held and holds" and how it is known 244-266.

Sermon on the mountain III 52.

Sheep and lambs of Christ III 219-224.

Shepherd, good in archeology III 244.

"Si diligis," Alloc. Of Pius XII on the Magisterium III 34 345 514 541 1295 1303,

Silence, obediential III of praxis, mouth, mind 666 676 720.

Society III 120; ecclesiastic, democratic, hierarchic, monarchic 121f.

"Sollemnis conventus," Sermon of Pius XII to the clerics studying in Rome III 866 878 879 882.

Son of man III 52 56.

Soul of the Church or quasi-soul is the Holy Spirit III 976 983 985 990-993 1007-1015; soul and body of the Church 1113-1118.

Spirit, Holy is quasi-soul of the Church III 976 983 985 990-993 1007-1015.

Status of secular Priests and religious proves the holiness of the Church III 1236-1240.

"Studiorum ducem," Encycl. of Pius XI on St. Thomas III 759 866 876 877 882.

Succession III 334; from the Apostles 347-355; 365 370; in the Primacy 386ff 395ff 400ff; law and condition of succession 387; Roman succession by divine right, ecclesiastic and mixed 440-446; formal and material succession 334 1178 1227.

Synagogue III 144f 147.

Temerarious and false proposition III 904f.

Text Hebrew of O.T. inasmuch as it is authentic IV 168; Greek of the N.T. inasmuch as it is authentic 167.

Themelion III 190 201 205 239.

Theology scholastic III 859 861; "lay" 514; foundation of dogmatic 6.

Theologians notion III 847 849 857; who they are 848 850-856; compilers 850; scholastic 851f.

Theologically certain III 888 905.

Theory of interpolations III 167; of interpretation 169; of idealization 168 181-185; of the three branches 494; form criticism 168 181-185.

Thomas, St. authority in theology III 871; intrinsic 872; extrinsic 873; canonical 874-878; what it implies 879f; how it obligates 881ff.

Three Chapters III 651ff 680.

Threefold Church: Petrine, Pauline, Johannine III 291; threefold power of the Church 34 117-136 1304-1327.

Tomus Damasi III 624.

Treatise on the Church presupposition III 1ff; method 5-11; sources 12; history 16ff; bibliography 19-

28; partitions 34; recapitulation 1285-1327.

Tractoria Zosimi III 624.

Tradition what it is III 769f; how many forms 771 774-777; nature 772f; organs of tradition 775; monuments of it 777; primary source of revelation 778 789-796; compared with Holy Scripture and the Magisterium 779 781; in Trent and Vatican I 786ff; surpasses Scripture 797-802; its argument 803f; its principal criteria are the consent of the Fathers 813-844; and consensus of Theologians 845-870."

"Tuas libenter," Letter of Pius IX to theologians III 551 669 673 861 895.

Tübingen critical school III 258.

Type typical sense IV 115-210; with help of tradition declared by the Church III 801.

Twelve Apostles III 90-105.

Unam Sanctam," Bull of Boniface VIII on the power and unity of the Church III 945 979 982 1094 1129 1132 1152.

Unicity is a property of the Church III 1122 1124-1127 1129 1131-1135 1139-1142.

Unity is a property of the Church III 1154-1162 1193-1197; it is a note of the Roman Church 1222f; of her alone 1242-1246; the Western Schism obscured but did not destroy unity 1278-1283.

Value theological of theses III 6; or propositions 886-905.

Values of Holy Scripture IV 267-294; literary 268f; supernatural 270.

Versions of Holy Scripture how inspiration is present in them IV 106f;

LXX version: inasmuch as it is authentic IV 166.

Vicar of Christ III 211 216 230 245 249-284 386 434 478 483f.

Vigilius Constitutum III 615f 680.

Vigilius judged twice III 651ff.

Visibility is a property of the Church III 1123f 1128 1130ff 1136ff 1143-1147.

Vulgate, version of III 681; IV 148-165; its division into chapters and verses III 13.

Witness of revelation III 748ff.

Word of God written and handed on III 779f 805f; in sentences of Scripture IV 123f.

Writers Christian and ecclesiastic III 821.